

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

82D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 2437

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 16 (legislative day, JANUARY 10), 1952

Mr. CHAVEZ introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

- 1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
- 2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
- 3 That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the
- 4 Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat.
- 5 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary
- 6 thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
- 7 sum of \$600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
- 8 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
- 9 1955.

1 The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be
2 available for expenditure as follows:

3 (a) \$270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
4 highway system.

5 (b) \$180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
6 secondary highway system.

7 (c) \$150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
8 highway system in urban areas.

9 The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year,
10 respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States
11 in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with
12 the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid High-
13 way Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat.
14 838) : *Provided*, That not more than 25 per centum of the
15 amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure
16 on the Federal-aid highway system or on the Federal-aid
17 secondary highway system, respectively, may be transferred
18 from the Federal-aid highway system for expenditure on the
19 Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-
20 aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Fed-
21 eral-aid highway system when such transfer is requested and
22 certified as being in the public interest by the State highway
23 department and is approved by the Commissioner of Public
24 Roads.

25 Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision

1 of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State
2 for eighteen months after the close of the fiscal year for which
3 such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned
4 remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse:
5 *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed
6 to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums
7 apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by
8 formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public Roads
9 for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this
10 Act.

11 SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
12 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as
13 amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be
14 appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of \$32,000,000
15 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for
16 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; and (2) for forest
17 development roads and trails the sum of \$28,000,000 for the
18 fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the
19 fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the appro-
20 priation herein authorized for forest highways shall be appor-
21 tioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the
22 several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with
23 the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
24 of 1950.

25 SEC. 3. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, im-

1 provement, and maintenance of roads and trails, inclusive
2 of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and
3 other areas administered by the National Park Service,
4 including areas authorized to be established as national parks
5 and monuments, and national park and monument approach
6 roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat.
7 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appro-
8 priated the sum of \$16,000,000 for the fiscal year ending
9 June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending
10 June 30, 1955.

11 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement,
12 and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Con-
13 gress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States,
14 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of
15 \$17,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and
16 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

17 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
18 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
19 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
20 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26,
21 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be ap-
22 propriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending
23 June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending
24 June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the location, type, and
25 design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved

1 by the Commissioner of Public Roads before any expendi-
2 tures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be
3 under the general supervision of the Commissioner of Public
4 Roads.

5 SEC. 4. Section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to pro-
6 vide for cooperation with Central American Republics in
7 the construction of the Inter-American Highway", approved
8 December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), is hereby amended to
9 read as follows:

10 "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addi-
11 tion to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,-
12 000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like
13 sum for each fiscal year thereafter up to and including the
14 fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, to be available until
15 expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with
16 the Governments of the American Republics situated in
17 Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Re-
18 publics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras,
19 Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and construction of
20 the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the afore-
21 said Republics, respectively. Not to exceed \$3,000,000 of
22 the appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be
23 expended without requiring the country or countries in which
24 such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if

1 the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing
2 said highway in such country or countries will be beyond
3 their reasonable capacity to bear. The expenditures au-
4 thorized by this section shall be made in accordance with
5 all provisions and limitations in section 11 of the Federal-
6 Aid Highway Act of 1950.”

7 SEC. 5. Recognizing the mutual benefits that will accrue
8 to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States from
9 the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in said
10 Republic of Nicaragua, the construction of which road was
11 begun and partially completed pursuant to an agreement
12 between said Republic and the United States, there is here-
13 by authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$8,000,000
14 for completing the construction of such road, to be available
15 until expended. No expenditure shall be made hereunder
16 for the construction of said road until a request therefor
17 shall have been received by the Secretary of State from the
18 Government of the Republic of Nicaragua nor until an agree-
19 ment shall have been entered into by said Republic with
20 the Secretary of State which shall provide, in part, that said
21 Republic—

22 (1) will provide, without participation of funds
23 herein authorized, all necessary right-of-way for the
24 construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall
25 be of a minimum width of one hundred meters in rural

1 areas and fifty meters in municipalities and shall forever
2 be held inviolate as a part of the highway for public use;

3 (2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit
4 any such toll to be charged, for the use of said highway
5 by vehicles or persons;

6 (3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly,
7 any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of said road
8 by vehicles or persons from the United States that does
9 not apply equally to vehicles or persons of such
10 Republic;

11 (4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of
12 vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance
13 with the provision of the Convention for the Regulation
14 of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened
15 for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington
16 on December 14, 1943, and to which such Republic and
17 the United States are parties; and

18 (5) will maintain said road after its completion in
19 proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present
20 and future traffic.

21 (b) The funds appropriated pursuant to this authoriza-
22 tion shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the
23 terms of this Act for the survey and construction of the said
24 road from San Benito to Rama in the Republic of Nicaragua
25 without being matched by said Republic, and all expendi-

1 tures made under the provisions of this Act for materials,
2 equipment, and supplies, shall, whenever practicable, be
3 made for products of the United States or of the Republic
4 of Nicaragua.

5 SEC. 6. Not to exceed \$15,000,000 of any money here-
6 tofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accord-
7 ance with the provision of the Federal Highway Act, as
8 amended and supplemented, shall be available for expendi-
9 ture by the Commissioner of Public Roads in accordance
10 with the provision of section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway
11 Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785) as an emergency relief fund.

12 SEC. 7. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
13 section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64
14 Stat. 785) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
15 for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance
16 of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public
17 lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations
18 the sum of \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
19 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
20 1955, to remain available until expended.

21 SEC. 8. The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized
22 and directed to assist in carrying out the action program of
23 the President's Highway Safety Conference and to cooperate
24 with the State highway departments and other agencies in
25 this program to advance the cause of safety on the streets and

1 highways: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$100,000 shall be
2 expended annually for the purposes of this section.

3 SEC. 9. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
4 section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat.
5 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid High-
6 way Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized
7 to be appropriated the additional sum of \$150,000,000 to
8 remain available until expended.

9 SEC. 10. If any section, subsection, or other provision
10 of this Act or the application thereof to any person or cir-
11 cumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the
12 application of such section, subsection, or other provision
13 to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected
14 thereby.

15 SEC. 11. That all Acts or parts of Acts in any way in-
16 consistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed,
17 and this Act shall take effect on its passage.

18 SEC. 12. This Act may be cited as the Federal-Aid
19 Highway Act of 1952.

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CHAVEZ

JANUARY 16 (legislative day, JANUARY 10), 1952
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Public Works

THE JOURNAL
OF THE
ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE



Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued April 2, 1952
For actions of April 1, 1952
82nd-2nd, No. 54

CONTENTS

Appropriations....4,8,10,12,22 23,24,25,26,27,28	Foreign aid.....20	Reclamation.....14,18
Daylight saving time.....3	Labor standards.....2	Reorganization.....1
Education.....21	National defense.....21	Reports.....5,6
Electrification.....18	Peanut quotas.....15	Research.....12
Flood control.....8	Personnel.....4	Road authorizations9,13
Food storage.....16	Prices.....17	Sugar.....7
Foot-and-mouth disease..11,12	Property, surplus.....1	Textiles.....19
	Purchasing.....2	Water utilization..18

HIGHLIGHTS: Sen. Thye introduced and discussed bill to appropriate for foot-and-mouth disease laboratory. House debated Army civil functions appropriation bill. House committee voted to report road authorizations bill. Senate committee voted to confer with agriculture committee on USDA-reorganization bill.

-oOo-

SENATE

- 1. REORGANIZATION.** The Government Operations Committee unanimously voted to postpone temporarily action on S. 1149, to reorganize the Agriculture Department. This decision was made for the purpose of consulting with the Senate and House agriculture committees concerning controversial substantive provisions of Secs. 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the revised bill (pp. 292-3).
This Committee also voted to report favorably a revised version of S. 1139, making certain changes in laws applicable to Government regulatory agencies (p. D293).
The Committee voted to refer to its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations S. Res. 291, which would provide for an investigation of methods of disposing of surplus property (p. D293).
- 2. PURCHASING; LABOR STANDARDS.** Sen. Ellender criticized administration of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, claiming that the Labor Department has exceeded the bounds of the Act by requiring prime contractors to certify that their subcontractors will abide by the law (pp. 3303-15).
- 3. DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME.** Agreed to the House amendment to S. 2667, authorizing the D. C. Commissioners to provide for daylight saving time in D. C. during 1952. The original Senate version would have made the authority permanent. (p. 3292.) This bill will now be sent to the President.
- 4. PERSONNEL; APPROPRIATIONS.** Received from the President a supplemental appropriation estimate for the Civil Service Commission of \$6,500,000; to Appropriations Committee (S. Doc. 114)(p. 3271).

5. CCC AUDIT. Received the GAO report on the audit of CCC for the fiscal year 1951 (p. 3272).
6. GAO REPORT. Received the annual report of GAO for the fiscal year 1951 (p. 3272).
7. SUGAR. Voted to remove the injunction of secrecy from the sugar protocol and refer it to the Foreign Relations Committee. The protocol would prolong for 1 year after Aug. 31, 1951, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar. (p. 3291.)

HOUSE

8. ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 7268. A considerable part of the debate was on the flood-control items. (pp. 3338-75.)
9. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. The Public Works ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 7340, which would authorize appropriations of \$550 million for the fiscal year 1954 and a like amount for the fiscal year 1955 for road construction and maintenance pursuant to the Federal-Aid Road Act (p. D295).
10. STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. The Rules Committee reported a resolution waiving points of order on this bill, H. R. 7289 (p. 3377).
11. FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE. The "Daily Digest" states: "Committee on Agriculture announced postponement for 1 week, until Wednesday, April 9, of the appearance of radio commentator, Robert Montgomery, in connection with the foot-and-mouth disease program. The committee, which has taken a leading part in formulating United States policy on foot-and-mouth disease, asked Montgomery to appear and make available to it the information regarding his criticism of the foot-and-mouth disease program in Mexico in a series of broadcasts about 2 weeks ago. He questioned the existence of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, and the necessity for the eradication program or the quarantine designed to prevent diseased animals from entering the United States." (p. D294.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

12. FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE RESEARCH. S. 2962, by Sen. Thyne (for himself and Sens. Mundt, Case, and Hunt), to appropriate \$25,000,000 for establishment of laboratories for research and study of foot-and-mouth disease and other animal diseases; to Appropriations Committee (p. 3273). Remarks of Sen. Thyne (pp. 3284-6).
13. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. H. R. 7340, by Rep. Buckley (see item 9 above); to Public Works Committee (p. 3377).
14. RECLAMATION. H. R. 7343, by Rep. Engle, Calif., to authorize the Trinity River development, Central Valley project; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 3377).

BILL APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

15. PEANUT QUOTAS. S. 2697, to repeal the authority for the marketing, for oil, of peanuts in excess of marketing quotas. Approved Mar. 28 (Public Law 285, 82nd Congress).

82D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7340

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 1, 1952

Mr. BUCKLEY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the
4 Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat.
5 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary
6 thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
7 sum of \$550,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
9 1955.

1 The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be
2 available for expenditure as follows:

3 (a) \$247,500,000 for projects on the Federal-Aid pri-
4 mary highway system.

5 (b) \$165,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid sec-
6 ondary highway system or as may hereafter be added to such
7 system in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of
8 section 3 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat.
9 838), as amended and supplemented by the Federal Aid
10 Highway Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105: *Provided, That*
11 such funds shall be expended on the secondary and feeder
12 roads, farm-to-market roads, rural mail routes, public school
13 bus routes, local rural roads, county roads, township roads,
14 and roads of the county-road class, with types of construction
15 that can be maintained at reasonable cost to provide all-
16 weather service, and the projects for construction shall be
17 selected and the specifications with respect thereto shall be
18 determined by the State highway department and the ap-
19 propriate local officials in cooperation with each other. This
20 provision shall not be construed to modify any of the other
21 provisions of paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal Aid
22 Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), as amended by the
23 Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105).

24 (c) \$137,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid high-
25 way primary system in urban areas.

1 The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year,
2 respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States
3 in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with
4 the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid
5 Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58
6 Stat. 838) : *Provided*, That not more than 25 per centum of
7 the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expend-
8 iture on the Federal-aid primary highway system or on the
9 Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may
10 be transferred from the Federal-aid primary highway system
11 for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system
12 or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for ex-
13 penditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system when
14 such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public
15 interest by the State highway department and is approved
16 by the Secretary of Commerce, but this proviso shall not be
17 construed to alter or impair the authority contained in the
18 last proviso of subsection (b), section 3, of the Federal-Aid
19 Highway Act of 1944.

20 Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions
21 of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State
22 for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such
23 sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned re-
24 maining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse:
25 *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed

1 to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums
2 apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by
3 formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the
4 improvement of specific projects as provided by this Act.

5 SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
6 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218),
7 as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized
8 to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of
9 \$22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and
10 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and
11 (2) for forest-development roads and trails the sum of
12 \$19,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and
13 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Pro-*
14 *vided*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest
15 highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Com-
16 merce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and
17 Puerto Rico in accordance with the provisions of section 3
18 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785):
19 *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce may
20 incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts
21 under the apportionment of such authorizations, and his
22 action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation
23 of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost
24 thereof: *Provided further*, That the appropriations made
25 pursuant to authorizations heretofore, herein, and hereafter

1 enacted for forest highways shall be considered available to
2 the Secretary of Commerce for the purpose of discharging
3 the obligations created hereunder in any State or Territory:
4 *Provided further*, That the total expenditures on account of
5 any State or Territory shall at no time exceed its authorized
6 apportionment: *And provided further*, That appropriations
7 for forest highways shall be administered in conformity with
8 regulations jointly approved by the Secretary of Commerce
9 and the Secretary of Agriculture.

10 SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
11 of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat.
12 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid High-
13 way Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized
14 to be appropriated the additional sum of \$12,000,000, which
15 shall be used for the construction and improvement of access
16 roads to timber and other sources of raw materials on lands
17 to which title is vested in the United States, said amount to
18 be available until expended: *Provided*, That the roads au-
19 thorized to be constructed under this section shall be certified
20 to the Secretary of Commerce as important to the national
21 defense by the Secretary of Defense or such other official as
22 the President may designate.

23 SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, im-
24 provement, and maintenance of roads and trails, inclusive

1 of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and
2 other areas administered by the National Park Service, in-
3 cluding areas authorized to be established as national parks
4 and monuments, and national park and monument approach
5 roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat.
6 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appro-
7 priated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending
8 June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending
9 June 30, 1955.

10 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement,
11 and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Con-
12 gress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States,
13 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of
14 \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and
15 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Pro-*
16 *vided*, That the limitation of \$13,000,000 on the cost of con-
17 struction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway prescribed
18 by the Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 400), is hereby
19 increased to \$14,500,000 and the additional sum of
20 \$1,500,000 hereby authorized shall be available for con-
21 tract immediately upon the passage of this Act.

22 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
23 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
24 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
25 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26,

1 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be
2 appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year
3 ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year
4 ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the location, type,
5 and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be
6 approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any ex-
7 penditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall
8 be under the general supervision of the Secretary of
9 Commerce.

10 SEC. 5. Recognizing the mutual benefits that will accrue
11 to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States from
12 the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in said
13 Republic of Nicaragua, the construction of which road was
14 begun and partially completed pursuant to an agreement
15 between said Republic and the United States, there is hereby
16 authorized to be appropriated \$4,000,000 for the fiscal year
17 ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year
18 ending June 30, 1954, for completing the construction of
19 such road, to be available until expended. No expenditure
20 shall be made hereunder for the construction of said road
21 until a request therefor shall have been received by the
22 Secretary of State from the Government of the Republic of
23 Nicaragua nor until an agreement shall have been entered
24 into by said Republic with the Secretary of State which
25 shall provide, in part, that said Republic—

1 (1) will provide, without participation of funds
2 herein authorized, all necessary right-of-way for the
3 construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall
4 be of a minimum width where practicable of one hundred
5 meters in rural areas and fifty meters in municipalities
6 and shall forever be held inviolate as a part of the
7 highway for public use;

8 (2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit
9 any such toll to be charged for the use of said highway
10 by vehicles or persons;

11 (3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly,
12 any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of said road by
13 vehicles or persons from the United States that does not
14 apply equally to vehicles or persons of such Republic;

15 (4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of
16 vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance
17 with the provisions of the Convention for the Regulation
18 of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened
19 for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington
20 on December 15, 1943, and to which such Republic and
21 the United States are parties; or any other treaty or
22 international convention establishing similar reciprocal
23 recognition; and

24 (5) will maintain said road after its completion in

proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.

(b) The funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the terms of this Act for the survey and construction of the said road from San Benito to Rama and for the survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff in the Republic of Nicaragua without being matched by said Republic, and all expenditures made under the provisions of this Act for materials, equipment, and supplies, shall, whenever practicable, be made for products of the United States or of the Republic of Nicaragua.

SEC. 6. Section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway", approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics

1 of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nica-
2 ragua, and Panama—in the survey and the construction of
3 the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the afore-
4 said Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the
5 appropriation for each fiscal year may be expended without
6 requiring the country or countries in which such sums may
7 be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of
8 State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in
9 such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable
10 capacity to bear. The expenditures authorized by this sec-
11 tion shall be made in accordance with all provisions and
12 limitations in section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
13 of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), not inconsistent with this section.”

14 SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Commerce shall prepare
15 and reexamine and revise annually a program setting forth
16 the essential actions which are necessary to increase and
17 promote safety on the highways, roads, and streets of the
18 United States. This program of essential actions shall in-
19 clude, but shall not be limited to, the formulation of desir-
20 able uniform legislation and ordinances for enactment by
21 States or local governments, the formulation of standards for
22 highway construction and vehicle control from the view-
23 point of safety and for safety features to be incorporated in
24 motor vehicles, the enlistment of public support for highway
25 safety through publicity and information campaigns and

1 otherwise, formulation of a uniform plan for the collection
2 and analysis of accident records, the promotion, in the school
3 systems and elsewhere, of education in traffic safety, the
4 promotion of uniform enforcement of traffic laws, the formu-
5 lation of uniform procedures for motor-vehicle administra-
6 tion, and the coordination of highway-safety activities of
7 all Federal departments and agencies.

8 In the furtherance of the objectives of highway safety,
9 the Secretary of Commerce shall, to the extent feasible, carry
10 out such program and in so doing shall cooperate to the full-
11 est extent possible with State, local, and private bodies de-
12 voted to the promotion of highway safety, with a view to
13 securing Nation-wide adherence to the program adopted pur-
14 suant to this section.

15 (b) The Secretary of Commerce shall make an annual
16 report to the Congress setting forth the actions taken pursu-
17 ant to this section. The annual report shall include or be
18 accompanied by the latest version of the program of essential
19 actions prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this
20 section.

21 (c) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
22 this section not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended an-
23 nually out of available administrative funds authorized by
24 the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented.

25 SEC. 8. If any section, subsection, or other provision

1 of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circum-
2 stance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the
3 application of such section, subsection, or other provision to
4 other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

5 SEC. 9. That all Acts or parts of Acts in any way in-
6 consistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed,
7 and this Act shall take effect on its passage.

8 SEC. 10. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid
9 Highway Act of 1952".



82ND CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 7340

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BUCKLEY

APRIL 1, 1952

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

Day's Review

For the purpose of the day's review, the following information is provided:

The following information is provided for the purpose of the day's review:

The following information is provided for the purpose of the day's review:

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued April 9, 1952

For actions of April 8, 1952

82nd-2nd, No. 59

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,8,21	Foreign aid.....5	Personnel training.....13
Budgeting.....1	Forestry.....2	Price controls.....17
Dairy industry.....6	Guayule rubber.....8	Price supports.....18
Education.....10	Holiday.....15	Reclamation.....12
Electrification.....13,22	Irrigation.....19	Research.....14
Emergency powers.....3,11	Legislative program.....7	Road authorizations....9
Expenditures.....24	Loans, farm.....3	St. Lawrence waterway..23
Family-farm program.....20	Meat production.....17	Soil conservation.....16
Flood control.....21	Organization, legislative.1	Taxation.....24
Foot-and-mouth disease....14		Weather control.....4

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed bill providing for joint budget committee. House debated defense appropriation bill. Rep. Wlitten discussed NSRB order on guayule rubber. Senate committee reported bill to permit Canada to enter forest-fire compact. House committee reported bill authorizing appropriations for forest roads. House passed measure continuing emergency powers (including one on veterans' preference for farm loans). Senate committee reported similar measure. Senate subcommittee approved weather-control research bill.

-ooo-

STAFF

1. **BUDGETING.** Passed, 55-8, with amendment S. 913, to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the Government (pp. 3720-4, 3730-41, 3743-52). Agreed to a Bridges amendment providing that the staff director of the joint budget committee be of the majority party and the associate director be of the minority party, a Saltonstall amendment providing that members of the staff of the joint committee be available to assist the appropriations committees, a Hayden amendment eliminating the language authorizing committee employees to examine agency estimates before they are reviewed by the Budget Bureau and the President, a Saltonstall amendment to include among Government-agency materials subject to examination by committee employees data relating to appropriations proposed in the annual budget, a Hayden amendment eliminating language providing for membership of the expenditures committees on the joint budget committee, and several perfecting amendments by Sen. McClellan. Rejected a McClellan amendment (on behalf of the Government Operations Committee) to require the President to submit a balanced budget.

This bill provides for a Joint Committee on the Budget, to consist of members of the Appropriations Committees, "paralleling, as to expenditures, the functions now performed by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in the revenue field." The joint committee would be required to inform itself on all aspects of annual budgets of the Government agencies, to examine expenditure reports, and to investigate the details of Federal operations in order that the Appropriations Committees might be provided with detailed information concerning

each item in the budget and the justifications therefor. It would also be required to fully utilize information from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and all other sources as to estimated revenues and changing economic conditions, in order that a well-considered fiscal program may be devised. The joint committee would also be authorized to report on and recommend appropriate legislative changes to standing jurisdictional committees so that they may eliminate wasteful practices and correct deviations from programs authorized by Congress, and to recommend cut-backs in programs. The committee would be required to submit, at the beginning of each regular session and periodically as necessary, schedules of total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by Congress, together with estimated costs of such programs and projects. The bill also provides that all committees reporting legislation authorizing appropriations must include in their reports estimates as to the initial cost of the project or program and its continuing cost over the succeeding 5 years. Also authorizes the joint committee to recommend joint hearings by the Appropriations Committees and subcommittees.

2. FORESTRY. The Foreign Relations Committee reported with amendment S. 1835, granting consent to Canadian participation in the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact (S. Rep. 1405) (p. 3714).

H. R. 4764, a similar bill which has already been passed by the House, was placed on the Senate calendar (p. 3720).

At the request of Sen. O'Mahoney, a monograph on the forests of Wyoming was ordered printed as S. Doc. 117 (p. 3720).

3. EMERGENCY POWERS. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment S. J. Res. 143, to continue until July 1, 1952, certain emergency powers which would otherwise expire when the President signs the Japanese treaty (S. Rep. 1451) (p. 3715). One of these powers provides for veterans' preference for certain Farmers' Home Administration loans.

4. WEATHER CONTROL. A subcommittee voted to report to the full Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with amendments S. 2225, to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification (p. D325).

5. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Morse inserted newspaper articles evaluating ECA accomplishments in the Philippines (pp. 3760-5).

6. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Sen. Wiley inserted resolutions of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association favoring continued emphasis on dairying, accelerated research on diseases, farm manpower deferment, and serving butter in school lunches (pp. 3743-4).

7. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. It was agreed that the calendar of unobjected-to bills will be called today (pp. 3759-60).

HOUSE

8. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Continued debate on this bill, H. R. 7391 (pp. 3769-805). Agreed to a Bonner amendment to reduce National Security Resources Board from \$1,500,000 to \$500,000. During discussion of this amendment Rep. Whitten criticized the Board's review of the guayule rubber proposal. (pp. 3777-80.)

9. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. The Public Works Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7340, to authorize road appropriations for the fiscal years 1954 and

1955 (H. Rept. 1730)(p. 3835). For each of these years the bill authorizes \$19,250,000 for forest-development roads and trails, \$22,000,000 for forest highways, \$247,500,000 for the primary highway system, \$165,000,000 for secondary highways, \$10,000,000 for roads and trails in national parks, \$10,000,000 for parkways, and several other authorizations. It also authorizes \$12,000,000 for access roads to timber and other sources of raw materials on U. S. lands, to be available until expended.

10. **EDUCATION.** The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6922, to amend Sec. 22 of the act of June 29, 1935, to extend its benefits (which relate to endowment and support of agricultural and mechanical-arts colleges) to Alaska (H. Rept. 1746)(p. 3835).
11. **EMERGENCY POWERS.** Passed without amendment H. J. Res. 423, a companion to S. J. Res. 148 (see item 3 of this Digest)(pp. 3824-7). This measure had been reported earlier in the day (H. Rept. 1747) pursuant to a message which had been received from the President (H. Doc. 416)(p. 3835).
12. **RECLAMATION.** Received the President's veto message on H. R. 3144, to direct the Interior Department to make certain cost adjustments on the Greenfields division of the Sun River irrigation project, Mont. (H. Doc. 420); to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (pp. 3823-4).

BILLS INTRODUCED

13. **PERSONNEL TRAINING.** S. 2987, by Sen. Johnston, to increase the efficiency of the Federal Government by improving the training of Federal civilian officers and employees; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 3717).
14. **FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE.** S. Res. 301, to direct the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, by June 1, to make a report on what should be done to finance a research program on this disease; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee. Remarks of author. (p. 3719.)
15. **HOLIDAY.** H. J. Res. 425, by Rep. Burdick, S. Dak., to make June 14 of each year a legal holiday; to Judiciary Committee (p. 3836).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

16. **SOIL CONSERVATION.** Sen. Kilgore inserted his recent radio interview with Dr. H. H. Bennett regarding soil conservation in W. Va. (pp. A2275-6).
17. **MEAT PRODUCTION.** Rep. Reed, N. Y., inserted a New York Times article quoting R. J. Kleberg (of Texas King Ranch) to the effect that the current drought was an important factor in reducing meat production and that removal of meat price controls was imperative to increase production (p. A2284).
18. **PRICE SUPPORTS.** Sen. Eastland inserted Sen. Young's recent report to his constituents favoring continuation of the farm price support program (pp. A2292-3).
19. **ELECTRIFICATION; IRRIGATION.** Rep. Rogers, Colo., inserted Mrs. Gracie Pfost's statement before the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee favoring construction of the Hells Canyon (Idaho) Dam which would provide for local irrigation water and electric power (pp. A2278-9).
Rep. Engle, Calif., inserted a Sacramento Bee editorial favoring his bill to develop electric power and divert irrigation water from the Trinity

River, Calif. (p. A2287).

Michigan

20. FAMILY-FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Thompson, Mich., inserted a Christian Advocate article criticizing the USDA family-farm program (p. A2321).
21. FLOOD CONTROL. Speeches in the House by Reps. Lovre, S. Dak., and D'Ewart, Mont., favoring additional flood-control appropriations (pp. A2287-9).
22. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Miller, N. Y., inserted a Daily Sentinel (Woodstock, Ill. editorial and a Niagara County Board of Supervisors' resolution favoring further development of hydroelectric power from the Niagara by private enterprise (pp. A2291, A2293).
23. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Rep. Van Zandt, Pa., inserted an Oil City (Pa.) Derrick editorial opposing construction of the seaway (pp. A2308-9).
24. TAXATION; EXPENDITURES. Rep. Scudder, Calif., inserted a Paradise, Calif., Chamber of Commerce resolution protesting high taxes and favoring reduction in expenditures (pp. 2290-1).

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR APR. 9: Foot-and-mouth disease inquiry, H. Agriculture (Robert Montgomery to testify). Agricultural and 3rd supplemental appropriation bills, S. Appropriations (ex). Defense Production Act extension, S. Banking (ex). O&C forest-land jurisdiction, H. Interior. Transportation bills, S. Interstate. School-construction aid, H. Education and Labor.

-0-

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 105A.

-0-

AMENDING AND SUPPLEMENTING THE FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT,
APPROVED JULY 11, 1916 (39 STAT. 355), AS AMENDED AND SUP-
PLEMENTED, TO AUTHORIZE APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONTINU-
ING THE CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS

APRIL 8, 1952.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. BUCKLEY, from the Committee on Public Works submitted the
following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 7340]

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The Subcommittee on Roads held extensive public hearings on H. R. 6094, H. R. 6180, and H. R. 6390, during which time testimony was offered by Federal, State, and local officials, Members of Congress, and witnesses representing agriculture, industry, highway users, and other groups interested in highway development.

At the conclusion of the hearings, the subcommittee adopted certain amendments to H. R. 6094, and H. R. 7340 was introduced as a substitute for H. R. 6094, as amended.

All the Federal-aid funds thus far authorized through the fiscal year 1953 have been apportioned. Early next year, the legislatures of 45 States will meet in regular biennial session. This makes it imperative that the present session of Congress enact legislation to provide Federal-aid authorizations for orderly continuation of the program of highway construction for an additional 2-year period so that funds for matching the Federal funds may be made available by the State legislatures that will be in session.

The bill, therefore, proposes to carry forward the Federal-aid highway program without substantial change from the basic pattern heretofore established by Congress under the Federal-Aid Highway

Acts of 1944, 1948, and 1950, and would authorize for such purposes the sum of \$550,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, to be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) \$247,500,000 (45 percent) for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) \$165,000,000 (30 percent) for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

(c) \$137,500,000 (25 percent) for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas.

The division of these funds, percentage-wise, among the three categories of projects, and their apportionment among the States is on the same basis as provided under existing law.

The testimony before the committee indicated general accord respecting existing Federal-aid procedures but reflected the urgent need for an accelerated highway construction program to overcome the serious deteriorations and deficiencies which have been accumulating at a greater rate than the rate of new construction. The American Association of State Highway Officials, which is an organization composed of the principal highway officials of all of the States, was represented by State highway officials who testified that carefully prepared estimates show that construction in the aggregate amount of \$32,000,000,000 now would be required to bring the Federal-aid system of highways up to date, as compared to \$29,000,000,000 two years ago. The association recommended 2 years ago and again in 1952 recommended \$810,000,000 as a minimum annual Federal-aid authorization which would be required to accomplish most urgently needed construction work over a 20-year period.

Data furnished by the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, reflect the tremendous increase in highway transportation in the expanding national economy. They show that motor-vehicle travel in the 2-year period from 1949 to 1951 has increased by about 61 billion vehicle-miles, that the increase of truck traffic with its heavy loads has been even greater than that of traffic as a whole, and that motor-vehicle registrations in 1951 are estimated at 52,217,000, which is about double the registrations in 1935.

The testimony offered also shows that price increases are having a serious effect upon the volume of improvements that can be financed from current Federal-aid authorizations.

The committee is of the view that the 2-year annual Federal-aid authorization of \$550,000,000 proposed by the bill is essential and is a conservative minimum in relation to the existing critical backlog of improvements required to provide an adequate highway transportation system—vital to the Nation's economy. The current easing of shortages in steel and other materials should facilitate accomplishment of such a program.

In addition to the authorizations for the regular Federal-aid program, the bill continues the authorizations for work in the national forests, the national parks and monuments, parkways, and roads on Indian reservations.

The reports of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce on H. R. 6094, which as amended is H. R. 7340, are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1952.

Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. BUCKLEY: Reference is made to your request for a report on H. R. 6094, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

I recommend that H. R. 6094 be enacted.

This bill would authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act of July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and certain other road construction laws, during the fiscal years 1954 and 1955. The portions of the bill that have a direct and major impact upon the work of the Department of the Interior are section 3 (a), which would authorize the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for national park roads in each of these fiscal years; section 3 (b), which would authorize the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for national parkways in each of these fiscal years; and section 3 (c), which would authorize the appropriation of \$10,000,000 for Indian reservation roads in each of these fiscal years. In addition, the work of the Department would be facilitated in some particulars by the authorizations contained in section 2 with respect to forests, highways, and forest development roads and trails.

There is an important need for continuing and expanding the road programs dealt with in section 3 and those other provisions of H. R. 6094 that affect natural resources. Public use of the National Park System has increased tremendously in recent years, but road improvement work has not kept pace with this growth. In many areas it has been impossible even to maintain existing park roads in an adequate state of repair. The Indian reservations are served for the most part by low-grade roads and truck trails, that often become impassable, and that constitute a real obstacle to the development of a self-supporting Indian economy.

Intensification of road construction and maintenance programs is essential for the protection, development and management of virtually all the lands under the jurisdiction of this Department, and for the full utilization of their resources in accordance with sound conservation principles. It has been the experience of this Department that, more than any other item, good roads contribute to the rapid and successful development of national parks and monuments, Indian reservations, and the public domain in general.

An adequate road program for these areas is also dictated by long-range fiscal considerations. To illustrate, the deferment during World War II of nearly all road work within the National Park System has resulted in a large number of the roads deteriorating to a point where extensive reconstruction will be necessary. The cost of such reconstruction will materially exceed the cost of the maintenance work that would have prevented this deterioration. The longer repairs are postponed, the greater will be the ultimate cost. On the Indian reservations numerous situations exist where local governments are prepared to take over from the Federal Government the obligation of maintaining the roads once these have been put in a condition that will not impose prohibitive maintenance burdens. Such transfers will result in permanent savings to the Federal Treasury, but cannot be effected until substantial investments have been made in improving the roads to present-day standards.

Most important of all, the lack of good roads within important areas of Indian and public lands effectually prevents utilization of resources that would yield substantial revenues to the Indians and to the United States, respectively. Examples of areas where this condition exists to a very marked degree are the Navajo and Hopi Indian reservations, and the public domain forests in western Oregon administered by this Department.

Work on the national parkways authorized by the Congress has been progressing at a rate too slow to admit of maximum economies in construction; 40 years or more will be required to complete these parkways at the present rate. This slow progress compares unfavorably with the public interest in the national parkways. Thus, the Blue Ridge Parkway, notwithstanding that only a little more than half of its projected mileage has been paved, now leads all areas of the national park system in visitor attendance.

Weighing all these factors, it is apparent that a far-sighted program of road development for national parks and parkways, public and Indian lands, will prove not only a long-range economy, but will contribute to the social and material welfare of this country and to the protection of our natural resources at a time when these factors are more vital than ever before.

In considering the adequacy of the provisions contained in H. R. 6094, this Department has taken into account the fact that these provisions supplement existing authorizations, both general and specific, contained in other laws, but do not supersede them. The statutes referred to in section 3 are permanent general legislation, under which amounts greater than those specified in the bill could be appropriated if the Congress decides to do so at any subsequent date. Special legislation also exists under which similar action could, and probably will, be taken. In particular, the Navajo-Hopi Rehabilitation Act of April 19, 1950 (64 Stat. 44) authorizes the appropriation of \$20,000,000 for a 10-year road improvement program on the Navajo and Hopi reservations. It is the understanding of this Department that the \$10,000,000 for Indian reservations specified in section 3 (c) of H. R. 6094 is not intended to preclude or prejudice in any way the appropriation of such sums, over and above that amount, as may be required to carry out the road program authorized by the act of April 19, 1950.

Viewed from the standpoint of long-term needs, the amounts stated in section 3 of H. R. 6094, and in other provisions of the bill bearing upon natural resources development, are modest. In fact, in some particulars, such as national park roads and national parkways, they are substantially less than commensurate with the needs for a far-sighted program. This Department recognizes, however, that during the existing national emergency shortages of funds and materials preclude the construction of roads and highways to the full extent justified for long-range development purposes.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your Committee.

Sincerely yours,

MASTIN G. WHITE,
Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D. C.

HON. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Public Works,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in further reply to your request of January 24 for the views of this Department concerning H. R. 6094, a bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

H. R. 6094 conforms to the recommendations contained in the President's budget message for 1953 (Congressional Record of January 21, 1952, p. 345), and it is identical to the draft of bill transmitted to the Speaker of the House with the Department's letter of January 8, 1952. Since transmitting said draft of bill to the Speaker of the House, however, further consideration by the Department of section 4 respecting the Inter-American Highway suggests the advisability of slightly amending said section to insure that the conditions and limitations in section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 will be retained and apply to the expenditure of the funds now proposed to be authorized. This can be accomplished by amending said section 4 to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway," approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$56,000,000, to

be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and completion of the construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear.”

In line with the foregoing, enactment of H. R. 6094 is favored by the Department.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of the pending bill would be in accord with the program of the President. If we can be of further assistance, please call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SAWYER, *Secretary of Commerce.*

Section 4 referred to in the report of the Secretary of Commerce is section 6 of H. R. 7340 and the amendment suggested is substantially incorporated therein.

A brief section-by-section analysis of the bill is set forth below:

SECTION 1. FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Section 1 of the bill authorizes the appropriation of \$550,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955. Said annual sum would be available for expenditure as follows: \$247,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system; \$165,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system; and \$137,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas. This division is on the same percentage basis as provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944, 1948, and 1950.

In arriving at the total authorization of \$550,000,000 for the Federal-aid highway program, the committee took into consideration the authorization of \$500,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1952 and 1953 by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 and increased construction costs experienced since passage of the 1950 act. The total authorized in H. R. 7340 represents a 10-percent increase over the 1950 act authorization for the Federal-aid highway system. It does not now appear likely that this increase will permit the same mileage as that provided for in the 1950 act.

The approximate amounts which each State would receive of the sums authorized by section 1 of the bill have been computed and are shown in the following table:

*Approximate apportionment of \$550,000,000 Federal-aid highway authorization,
pursuant to H. R. 7250*

State	Primary (\$247,500,000)	Secondary (\$165,000,000)	Urban (\$137,500,000)	Total (\$550,000,000)
Alabama.....	\$5,135,000	\$3,984,000	\$1,745,000	\$10,864,000
Arizona.....	3,624,000	2,468,000	518,000	6,610,000
Arkansas.....	4,026,000	3,221,000	745,000	7,995,000
California.....	11,177,000	5,757,000	11,837,000	28,771,000
Colorado.....	4,387,000	2,930,000	1,107,000	8,424,000
Connecticut.....	1,542,000	794,000	2,579,000	4,915,000
Delaware.....	1,191,000	794,000	273,000	2,258,000
Florida.....	3,865,000	2,525,000	2,388,000	8,778,000
Georgia.....	6,040,000	4,610,000	1,941,000	12,591,000
Idaho.....	3,011,000	2,117,000	256,000	5,384,000
Illinois.....	9,370,000	5,103,000	9,313,000	23,786,000
Indiana.....	5,773,000	3,979,000	3,186,000	12,938,000
Iowa.....	5,914,000	4,325,000	1,581,000	11,820,000
Kansas.....	5,945,000	4,160,000	1,252,000	11,357,000
Kentucky.....	4,469,000	3,711,000	1,383,000	9,563,000
Louisiana.....	3,755,000	2,720,000	1,952,000	8,427,000
Maine.....	2,051,000	1,467,000	557,000	4,075,000
Maryland.....	2,129,000	1,300,000	2,297,000	5,689,000
Massachusetts.....	3,062,000	1,129,000	5,543,000	9,734,000
Michigan.....	7,565,000	4,617,000	6,198,000	18,380,000
Minnesota.....	6,405,000	4,517,000	2,168,000	13,090,000
Mississippi.....	4,341,000	3,616,000	2,737,000	8,694,000
Missouri.....	7,006,000	4,740,000	3,279,000	15,025,000
Montana.....	4,923,000	3,385,000	314,000	8,622,000
Nebraska.....	4,724,000	3,350,000	781,000	8,855,000
Nevada.....	3,150,000	2,105,000	101,000	5,356,000
New Hampshire.....	1,191,000	794,000	386,000	2,371,000
New Jersey.....	3,152,000	1,064,000	5,829,000	10,045,000
New Mexico.....	2,981,000	2,734,000	437,000	7,152,000
New York.....	11,422,000	4,575,000	17,799,000	33,796,000
North Carolina.....	5,995,000	5,126,000	1,711,000	12,832,000
North Dakota.....	3,548,000	2,575,000	225,000	6,348,000
Ohio.....	8,466,000	5,149,000	7,796,000	21,321,000
Oklahoma.....	5,217,000	3,734,000	1,455,000	10,406,000
Oregon.....	4,178,000	2,919,000	1,068,000	8,165,000
Pennsylvania.....	9,548,000	5,682,000	10,081,000	25,311,000
Rhode Island.....	1,191,000	794,000	952,000	2,937,000
South Carolina.....	3,234,000	2,717,000	916,000	6,917,000
South Dakota.....	3,797,000	2,712,000	259,000	6,768,000
Tennessee.....	5,183,000	4,049,000	1,926,000	11,158,000
Texas.....	15,736,000	10,535,000	6,380,000	32,651,000
Utah.....	2,795,000	1,848,000	564,000	5,207,000
Vermont.....	1,191,000	794,000	207,000	2,192,000
Virginia.....	4,625,000	3,593,000	2,077,000	10,295,000
Washington.....	4,033,000	2,694,000	2,009,000	8,736,000
West Virginia.....	2,651,000	2,307,000	867,000	5,825,000
Wisconsin.....	5,780,000	4,031,000	2,608,000	12,419,000
Wyoming.....	3,032,000	2,055,000	145,000	5,233,000
Hawaii.....	1,191,000	794,000	448,000	2,433,000
District of Columbia.....	1,191,000	794,000	1,150,000	3,135,000
Puerto Rico.....	1,260,000	1,317,000	1,145,000	3,722,000

The committee has inserted the word "primary" after the words "Federal-aid" in section 1 (a) to clearly distinguish highways on the Federal-aid primary highway system when compared to those on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

The bill provides that the sums apportioned to each State under the provisions of section 1 shall be available for expenditure for two fiscal years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized and that any money so apportioned that remains unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse. It further provides that such sums shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects. It, therefore, would follow that any money not expended within the period provided by the law would lapse and be covered into the Treasury. These provisions are identical with those concerning the period of availability of funds authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1948 and 1950.

Section 1 modifies existing law and procedures with respect to transfer of Federal-aid highway funds. It would permit not exceeding 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, to be transferred from the Federal-aid primary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system. Such transfer would be effective only when requested and certified by the State highway department as being in the public interest, and approved by the Secretary of Commerce. This new provision is designed in the interest of flexibility. It would make it possible for transfers to be made from the primary system funds for expenditure in the development of projects on the secondary system, whereas heretofore the law (sec. 3 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944) authorized the transfer, under certain conditions, of secondary funds only. Under existing law only the States of Delaware, North Carolina, and West Virginia, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico may transfer funds from the Federal-aid secondary highway system to the Federal-aid primary highway system, provided such transfer is requested by their respective highway departments and approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

SECTION 2. FOREST HIGHWAYS AND FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

Section 2 would authorize to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 the sum of \$22,000,000 for forest highways and the sum of \$19,250,000 for forest development roads and trails, subject to the same terms and conditions as provided by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950. Said sums are \$2,000,000 more than were authorized for forest highways and \$1,750,000 more than were authorized for forest development roads and trails by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950. Increased construction costs will more than absorb this 10-percent increase in the authorizations of this section.

SECTION 3. ACCESS ROADS

Section 3 of the bill would authorize the additional sum of \$12,000,000 for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended by section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950. It would require that said sum be used for the construction and improvement of access roads to timber and other sources of raw materials on lands to which title is vested in the United States, subject to the requirement that such roads to be eligible for construction under this section shall be certified to the Secretary of Commerce as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense or such other official as the President may designate, as is required for other access roads under the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended. It is the sense of the committee that in the expenditure of the sum authorized by this section approximately two-thirds thereof should be utilized for the construction of roads to provide access to timber on lands owned by the United States and that the remaining one-third should be used to provide access to strategic minerals needed for defense purposes. This authorization will supplement section 2 of the bill.

SECTION 4 (A). PARK ROADS AND TRAILS

Section 4 (a) provides an authorization of \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1954 and 1955, for roads, trails, and bridges in national parks and monuments and approach roads thereto, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments. The sums authorized are the same in amount as were authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953.

SECTION 4 (B). PARKWAYS

Section 4 (b) would authorize the sum of \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1954 and 1955, for the construction and maintenance of parkways over lands to which title is vested in the United States. It would also increase from \$13,000,000 to \$14,500,000 the limitation imposed by the act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 400), on the cost of constructing the Baltimore-Washington Parkway between Fort Meade, Md., and Washington and would make the additional sum of \$1,500,000, which it would authorize, available for contract immediately upon the passage of the bill. Aside from the increase in the limitation on the cost of Baltimore-Washington Parkway, the authorization contained in this section is \$3,000,000 less than was authorized for parkways under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953.

The following communication from Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads, to the Honorable George H. Fallon, chairman, Subcommittee on Roads, sets forth the justification for the increased authorization for the construction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway between Fort Meade and Washington:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
BUREAU OF PUBLIC ROADS,
Washington, March 10, 1952.

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FALLON: This letter supplements our recent conversation concerning the Baltimore-Washington Parkway. Grading is practically complete except for the bridge approaches on the section between Jessup Road and the Laurel-Bowie Road, about 6½ miles long. All of the bridges on this section are now under contract and should be completed by July. Accordingly, if funds were available, we could advertise for bids on paving this section in July or August.

Between the Laurel-Bowie Road and Washington, 3 miles have been graded, and six bridges are now under contract. There are five bridges and some 9 miles of grading between the Laurel-Bowie Road and Washington which have not yet been placed under contract.

The total authorization, as you know, is \$13,000,000. Of this amount, \$5,700,000 has been appropriated. All of the amount appropriated is obligated by contracts awarded except about \$200,000. This amount will probably be sufficient to build the smallest bridge of the five yet remaining to be let to contract, and we expect to advertise for bids on that bridge in the near future. Beyond that, no further work can be advertised for bids until an additional appropriation or contract authority is made available.

As nearly as we can now estimate, it will cost a total of about \$14,500,000 to complete this project. This is \$1,500,000 in excess of the authorization. The

estimate on which the authorization was based was, as you recall, made in May 1950, before Korea. Also, the original estimates did not include the Anacostia River Bridge, which was added to the parkway by the committee. Since that time, general highway costs have increased about 19 percent and bridge costs have increased about 28 percent.

There is no available balance of contractual authority at the present time. The budget request for 1953 is for the appropriation of \$6,750,000 of the remaining \$7,300,000 of the authorization. The amount of money in the proposed budget for 1953 represents about all of the work that can be placed under contract in the coming fiscal year. We would need the balance of the current authorization plus the additional one and one-half million authorization available for contract by July of 1953.

Very truly yours,

THOS. H. MACDONALD,
Commissioner of Public Roads.

SECTION 4 (C). INDIAN ROADS

Section 4 (c) would authorize the sum of \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1954 and 1955, for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and bridges within Indian reservations and to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands in accordance with provisions of the act of May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750). This sum is \$4,000,000 more than was authorized for the same purpose by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953. The increased amount is deemed necessary to implement the withdrawal program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, so that roads now badly deteriorated, can be put in condition to be taken over by the counties, thus relieving the Government of all future responsibility.

SECTION 5. RAMA ROAD

Section 5 would authorize the sum of \$4,000,000 to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1953 and 1954, for the completion of the construction of the road from San Benito to Rama in the Republic of Nicaragua, pursuant to an agreement between said Republic and the United States. The expenditure of said sum would be subject to certain safeguarding conditions and limitations which are prescribed in the section.

SECTION 6. INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Section 6 would authorize to be appropriated the additional sum of \$8,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1953 and 1954, to enable the United States to continue its cooperation with the American Republics in Central America in the survey and construction of the Inter-American Highway within said republics. The appropriations so authorized would be required to be expended subject to the matching requirements and conditions contained in existing legislation except that not to exceed one-third of the appropriation for each fiscal year may be expended without the requirement of matching on the part of any republic if the Secretary of State should find that the cost of constructing the highway in such republic

will be beyond its reasonable capacity to bear. The annual sum of \$8,000,000 proposed by the bill is twice the amount authorized for the same purpose by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1951 and 1952, and such sum is considered necessary to accelerate the work in order that the project may be completed within a reasonable number of years.

SECTION 7. HIGHWAY SAFETY

Section 7 is a new provision which would require the Secretary of Commerce to prepare, and reexamine and revise annually, an action program to increase and promote safety on the highways, roads, and streets throughout the United States. The coordination of highway-safety activities of all Federal departments and agencies would be included in such program. The bill would provide that in carrying out such program the Secretary of Commerce shall cooperate to the fullest extent possible with State, local, and private bodies devoted to the promotion of highway safety, and that he shall make an annual report to the Congress setting forth the actions taken pursuant to this section. For such purposes, the section would authorize not to exceed \$200,000 to be expended annually out of available administrative funds of the Bureau of Public Roads. Section 14 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 authorized the Bureau of Public Roads to expend not to exceed \$75,000 annually for highway safety. The committee is of the view that the program proposed by section 7 is most desirable by reason of the increasingly heavy toll in lives and property damage each year from motor-vehicle accidents as reflected by the following table:

Motor-vehicle accidents, 1945-50¹

	Number of accidents	Number of nonfatal injuries	Number of deaths	Property damage
Calendar year—				
1945.....	5,500,000	1,000,000	28,076	\$650,000,000
1946.....	6,150,000	1,200,000	33,411	900,000,000
1947.....	8,400,000	1,150,000	32,697	1,100,000,000
1948.....	8,200,000	1,100,000	32,259	1,100,000,000
1949.....	7,600,000	1,100,000	31,500	1,100,000,000
1950.....	8,300,000	1,200,000	35,000	1,250,000,000
1951.....			² 37,500	

¹ Source: National Safety Council's "Accident Facts."

² Preliminary estimate by National Safety Council.

Section 8 is a saving provision to the effect that if any section, subsection, or other provision of the bill, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the validity of the remainder thereof.

Section 9 provides for the repeal of all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the bill and that the bill shall take effect upon its passage.

Section 10 provides that the bill may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952."

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law proposed by the bill are shown in parallel columns as follows:

EXISTING LAW

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1944

(58 Stat. 838)

SEC. 3. * * * *Provided further*, That any of such funds for secondary and feeder roads which are apportioned to a State in which all public roads and highways are under the control and supervision of the State highway department may, if the State highway department and the Commissioner of Public Roads jointly agree that such funds are not needed for secondary and feeder roads, be expended for projects in such State on the Federal-aid highway system.

PUBLIC LAW 643, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

(64 Stat. 400)

SEC. 6. The cost of construction of the parkway shall not exceed the additional sum of \$13,000,000.

NEW LANGUAGE

(SEC. 1.) * * * *Provided*, That not more than 25 per centum of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may be transferred from the Federal-aid primary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system when such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public interest by the State highway department and is approved by the Secretary of Commerce, but this proviso shall not be construed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso of subsection (b), section 3, of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

SEC. 4 (b): * * * *Provided*, That the limitation of \$13,000,000 on the cost of construction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway prescribed by the Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 400), is hereby increased to \$14,500,000 and the additional sum of \$1,500,000 hereby authorized shall be available for contract immediately upon the passage of this Act.

PUBLIC LAW 375, SEVENTY-SEVENTH
CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

(55 Stat. 860)

(SEC. 1) That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum not to exceed \$20,000,000 to enable the United States to cooperate with the governments of the American republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and construction of the proposed Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid republics. Expenditures of such sums in any such country shall be subject to the receipt of a request therefor and of satisfactory assurances from the government of that country that appropriate commitments have been made by such government to assume at least one-third of the expenditures proposed to be incurred henceforth by that country and by the United States in the survey and construction of such highway within the borders of such country. In no such country shall the expenditures of this Government from the appropriations herein authorized exceed two-thirds of the total expenses henceforth incurred for said survey and construction in that country. No expenditures shall be made hereunder for the construction of said highway until the government of each of the above-named countries shall have given satisfactory assurance to the United States that it will assume at least one-third of the expenditures proposed to be incurred henceforth by that government and by the United States in the survey and construction of such highway within the borders of such country, or has given other assurances satisfactory to the President that it has made appropriate arrangements to complete such survey and construction within a reasonable period. All expenditures by the United States under the provisions of this Act for material, equipment, and supplies shall, whenever practicable, be made for products of the United States or of the country in which such survey or construction work is being carried on.

SEC. 6. Section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway", approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and the construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear. The expenditures authorized by this section shall be made in accordance with all provisions and limitations in section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), not inconsistent with this section."

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1950

(64 Stat. 785)

SEC. 14. * * * The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized and directed to assist in carrying out the action program of the President's Highway Safety Conference and to cooperate with the State highway departments and other agencies in this program to advance the cause of safety on the streets and highways: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$75,000 shall be expended annually for the purposes of this section.

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Commerce shall prepare and reexamine and revise annually a program setting forth the essential actions which are necessary to increase and promote safety on the highways, roads, and streets of the United States. This program of essential actions shall include, but shall not be limited to, the formulation of desirable uniform legislation and ordinances for enactment by States or local governments, the formulation of standards for highway construction and vehicle control from the viewpoint of safety and for safety features to be incorporated in motor vehicles, the enlistment of public support for highway safety through publicity and information campaigns and otherwise, formulation of a uniform plan for the collection and analysis of accident records, the promotion, in the school systems and elsewhere, of education in traffic safety, the promotion of uniform enforcement of traffic laws, the formulation of uniform procedures for motor-vehicle administration, and the coordination of highway-safety activities of all Federal departments and agencies.

In the furtherance of the objectives of highway safety, the Secretary of Commerce shall, to the extent feasible, carry out such program and in so doing shall cooperate to the fullest extent possible with State, local, and private bodies devoted to the promotion of highway safety, with a view to securing Nation-wide adherence to the program adopted pursuant to this section.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce shall make an annual report to the Congress setting forth the actions taken pursuant to this section. The annual report shall include or be accompanied by the latest version of the program of essential actions prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

(c) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended annually out of available administrative funds authorized by the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented.

TEXT OF THE BILL

The bill recommended by the Committee is as follows:

[H. R. 7340, 82d Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$550,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) \$247,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) \$165,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or as may hereafter be added to such system in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), as amended and supplemented by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105): *Provided*, That such funds shall be expended on the secondary and feeder roads, farm-to-market roads, rural mail routes, public school bus routes, local rural roads, county roads, township roads, and roads of the county-road class, with types of construction that can be maintained at reasonable cost to provide all-weather service, and the projects for construction shall be selected and the specifications with respect thereto shall be determined by the State highway department and the appropriate local officials in cooperation with each other. This provision shall not be construed to modify any of the other provisions of paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), as amended by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105).

(c) \$137,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838): *Provided*, That not more than 25 per centum of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may be transferred from the Federal-aid primary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system when such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public interest by the State highway department and is approved by the Secretary of Commerce, but this proviso shall not be construed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso of subsection (b), section 3, of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this Act.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of \$22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and (2) for forest-development roads and trails the sum of \$19,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785): *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce may incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under the apportionment of such authorizations, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal

Government for the payment of the cost thereof: *Provided further*, That the appropriations made pursuant to authorizations heretofore, herein, and hereafter enacted for forest highways shall be considered available to the Secretary of Commerce for the purpose of discharging the obligations created hereunder in any State or Territory: *Provided further*, That the total expenditures on account of any State or Territory shall at no time exceed its authorized apportionment: *And provided further*, That appropriations for forest highways shall be administered in conformity with regulations jointly approved by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$12,000,000, which shall be used for the construction and improvement of access roads to timber and other sources of raw materials on lands to which title is vested in the United States, said amount to be available until expended: *Provided*, That the roads authorized to be constructed under this section shall be certified to the Secretary of Commerce as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense or such other official as the President may designate.

SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the limitation of \$13,000,000 on the cost of construction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway prescribed by the Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 400), is hereby increased to \$14,500,000 and the additional sum of \$1,500,000 hereby authorized shall be available for contract immediately upon the passage of this Act.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 5. Recognizing the mutual benefits that will accrue to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States from the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in said Republic of Nicaragua, the construction of which road was begun and partially completed pursuant to an agreement between said Republic and the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, for completing the construction of such road, to be available until expended. No expenditure shall be made hereunder for the construction of said road until a request therefor shall have been received by the Secretary of State from the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua or until an agreement shall have been entered into by said Republic with the Secretary of State which shall provide, in part, that said Republic—

(1) will provide, without participation of funds herein authorized, all necessary right-of-way for the construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall be of a minimum width where practicable of one hundred meters in rural areas and fifty meters in municipalities and shall forever be held inviolate as a part of the highway for public use;

(2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit any such toll to be charged for the use of said highway by vehicles or persons;

(3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly, any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of said road by vehicles or persons from the United States that does not apply equally to vehicles or persons of such Republic;

(4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance with the provisions of the Convention for the Regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington on December 15, 1943, and to which such Republic and the United States are parties; or any other treaty or international convention establishing similar reciprocal recognition; and

(5) will maintain said road after its completion in proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.

(b) The funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the terms of this Act for the survey and construction of the said road from San Benito to Rama and for the survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff in the Republic of Nicaragua without being matched by said Republic, and all expenditures made under the provisions of this Act for materials, equipment, and supplies, shall, whenever practicable, be made for products of the United States or of the Republic of Nicaragua.

SEC. 6. Section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway", approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), is hereby amended to read as follows: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and the construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear. The expenditures authorized by this section shall be made in accordance with all provisions and limitations in section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), not inconsistent with this section."

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Commerce shall prepare and reexamine and revise annually a program setting forth the essential actions which are necessary to increase and promote safety on the highways, roads, and streets of the United States. This program of essential actions shall include, but shall not be limited to, the formulation of desirable uniform legislation and ordinances for enactment by States or local governments, the formulation of standards for highway construction and vehicle control from the viewpoint of safety and for safety features to be incorporated in motor vehicles, the enlistment of public support for highway safety through publicity and information campaigns and otherwise, formulation of a uniform plan for the collection and analysis of accident records, the promotion, in the school systems and elsewhere, of education in traffic safety, the promotion of uniform enforcement of traffic laws, the formulation of uniform procedures for motor-vehicle administration, and the coordination of highway-safety activities of all Federal departments and agencies.

In the furtherance of the objectives of highway safety, the Secretary of Commerce shall, to the extent feasible, carry out such program and in so doing shall cooperate to the fullest extent possible with State, local, and private bodies devoted to the promotion of highway safety, with a view to securing Nation-wide adherence to the program adopted pursuant to this section.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce shall make an annual report to the Congress setting forth the actions taken pursuant to this section. The annual report shall include or be accompanied by the latest version of the program of essential actions prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

(c) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended annually out of available administrative funds authorized by the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented.

SEC. 8. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 9. That all Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed, and this Act shall take effect on its passage.

SEC. 10. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952".

82D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 7340

[Report No. 1730]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 1, 1952

Mr. BUCKLEY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works

APRIL 8, 1952

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the
4 Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat.
5 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary
6 thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
7 sum of \$550,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
9 1955.

1 The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be
2 available for expenditure as follows:

3 (a) \$247,500,000 for projects on the Federal-Aid pri-
4 mary highway system.

5 (b) \$165,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid sec-
6 ondary highway system or as may hereafter be added to such
7 system in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of
8 section 3 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat.
9 838), as amended and supplemented by the Federal Aid
10 Highway Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105: *Provided, That*
11 such funds shall be expended on the secondary and feeder
12 roads, farm-to-market roads, rural mail routes, public school
13 bus routes, local rural roads, county roads, township roads,
14 and roads of the county-road class, with types of construction
15 that can be maintained at reasonable cost to provide all-
16 weather service, and the projects for construction shall be
17 selected and the specifications with respect thereto shall be
18 determined by the State highway department and the ap-
19 propriate local officials in cooperation with each other. This
20 provision shall not be construed to modify any of the other
21 provisions of paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal Aid
22 Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), as amended by the
23 Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105).

24 (c) \$137,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid high-
25 way primary system in urban areas.

1 The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year,
2 respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States
3 in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with
4 the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid
5 Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58
6 Stat. 838) : *Provided*, That not more than 25 per centum of
7 the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expend-
8 iture on the Federal-aid primary highway system or on the
9 Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may
10 be transferred from the Federal-aid primary highway system
11 for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system
12 or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for ex-
13 penditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system when
14 such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public
15 interest by the State highway department and is approved
16 by the Secretary of Commerce, but this proviso shall not be
17 construed to alter or impair the authority contained in the
18 last proviso of subsection (b), section 3, of the Federal-Aid
19 Highway Act of 1944.

20 Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions
21 of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State
22 for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such
23 sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned re-
24 maining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse:
25 *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed

1 to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums
2 apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by
3 formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the
4 improvement of specific projects as provided by this Act.

5 SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
6 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218),
7 as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized
8 to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of
9 \$22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and
10 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and
11 (2) for forest-development roads and trails the sum of
12 \$19,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and
13 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Pro-*
14 *vided*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest
15 highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Com-
16 merce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and
17 Puerto Rico in accordance with the provisions of section 3
18 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785):
19 *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce may
20 incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts
21 under the apportionment of such authorizations, and his
22 action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation
23 of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost
24 thereof: *Provided further*, That the appropriations made
25 pursuant to authorizations heretofore, herein, and hereafter

1 enacted for forest highways shall be considered available to
2 the Secretary of Commerce for the purpose of discharging
3 the obligations created hereunder in any State or Territory:
4 *Provided further*, That the total expenditures on account of
5 any State or Territory shall at no time exceed its authorized
6 apportionment: *And provided further*, That appropriations
7 for forest highways shall be administered in conformity with
8 regulations jointly approved by the Secretary of Commerce
9 and the Secretary of Agriculture.

10 SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
11 of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat.
12 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid High-
13 way Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized
14 to be appropriated the additional sum of \$12,000,000, which
15 shall be used for the construction and improvement of access
16 roads to timber and other sources of raw materials on lands
17 to which title is vested in the United States, said amount to
18 be available until expended: *Provided*, That the roads au-
19 thorized to be constructed under this section shall be certified
20 to the Secretary of Commerce as important to the national
21 defense by the Secretary of Defense or such other official as
22 the President may designate.

23 SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, im-
24 provement, and maintenance of roads and trails, inclusive

1 of necessary bridges. in national parks, monuments. and
2 other areas administered by the National Park Service, in-
3 cluding areas authorized to be established as national parks
4 and monuments, and national park and monument approach
5 roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat.
6 1053). as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appro-
7 priated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending
8 June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending
9 June 30, 1955.

10 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement,
11 and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Con-
12 gress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States,
13 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of
14 \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and
15 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Pro-*
16 *vided*, That the limitation of \$13,000,000 on the cost of con-
17 struction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway prescribed
18 by the Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 400), is hereby
19 increased to \$14,500,000 and the additional sum of
20 \$1,500,000 hereby authorized shall be available for con-
21 tract immediately upon the passage of this Act.

22 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
23 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
24 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
25 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26,

1 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be
2 appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year
3 ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year
4 ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the location, type,
5 and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be
6 approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any ex-
7 penditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall
8 be under the general supervision of the Secretary of
9 Commerce.

10 SEC. 5. Recognizing the mutual benefits that will accrue
11 to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States from
12 the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in said
13 Republic of Nicaragua, the construction of which road was
14 begun and partially completed pursuant to an agreement
15 between said Republic and the United States, there is hereby
16 authorized to be appropriated \$4,000,000 for the fiscal year
17 ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year
18 ending June 30, 1954, for completing the construction of
19 such road, to be available until expended. No expenditure
20 shall be made hereunder for the construction of said road
21 until a request therefor shall have been received by the
22 Secretary of State from the Government of the Republic of
23 Nicaragua nor until an agreement shall have been entered
24 into by said Republic with the Secretary of State which
25 shall provide, in part, that said Republic—

1 (1) will provide, without participation of funds
2 herein authorized, all necessary right-of-way for the
3 construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall
4 be of a minimum width where practicable of one hundred
5 meters in rural areas and fifty meters in municipalities
6 and shall forever be held inviolate as a part of the
7 highway for public use;

8 (2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit
9 any such toll to be charged for the use of said highway
10 by vehicles or persons;

11 (3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly,
12 any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of said road by
13 vehicles or persons from the United States that does not
14 apply equally to vehicles or persons of such Republic;

15 (4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of
16 vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance
17 with the provisions of the Convention for the Regulation
18 of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened
19 for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington
20 on December 15, 1943, and to which such Republic and
21 the United States are parties; or any other treaty or
22 international convention establishing similar reciprocal
23 recognition; and

24 (5) will maintain said road after its completion in

proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.

(b) The funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the terms of this Act for the survey and construction of the said road from San Benito to Rama and for the survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff in the Republic of Nicaragua without being matched by said Republic, and all expenditures made under the provisions of this Act for materials, equipment, and supplies, shall, whenever practicable, be made for products of the United States or of the Republic of Nicaragua.

SEC. 6. Section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway", approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics

1 of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nica-
2 ragua, and Panama—in the survey and the construction of
3 the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the afore-
4 said Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the
5 appropriation for each fiscal year may be expended without
6 requiring the country or countries in which such sums may
7 be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of
8 State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in
9 such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable
10 capacity to bear. The expenditures authorized by this sec-
11 tion shall be made in accordance with all provisions and
12 limitations in section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
13 of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), not inconsistent with this section.”

14 SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Commerce shall prepare
15 and reexamine and revise annually a program setting forth
16 the essential actions which are necessary to increase and
17 promote safety on the highways, roads, and streets of the
18 United States. This program of essential actions shall in-
19 clude, but shall not be limited to, the formulation of desir-
20 able uniform legislation and ordinances for enactment by
21 States or local governments, the formulation of standards for
22 highway construction and vehicle control from the view-
23 point of safety and for safety features to be incorporated in
24 motor vehicles, the enlistment of public support for highway
25 safety through publicity and information campaigns and

1 otherwise, formulation of a uniform plan for the collection
2 and analysis of accident records, the promotion, in the school
3 systems and elsewhere, of education in traffic safety, the
4 promotion of uniform enforcement of traffic laws, the formu-
5 lation of uniform procedures for motor-vehicle administra-
6 tion, and the coordination of highway-safety activities of
7 all Federal departments and agencies.

8 In the furtherance of the objectives of highway safety,
9 the Secretary of Commerce shall, to the extent feasible, carry
10 out such program and in so doing shall cooperate to the full-
11 est extent possible with State, local, and private bodies de-
12 voted to the promotion of highway safety, with a view to
13 securing Nation-wide adherence to the program adopted pur-
14 suant to this section.

15 (b) The Secretary of Commerce shall make an annual
16 report to the Congress setting forth the actions taken pursu-
17 ant to this section. The annual report shall include or be
18 accompanied by the latest version of the program of essential
19 actions prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this
20 section.

21 (c) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of
22 this section not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended an-
23 nually out of available administrative funds authorized by
24 the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented.

25 SEC. 8. If any section, subsection, or other provision

1 of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circum-
2 stance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the
3 application of such section, subsection, or other provision to
4 other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

5 SEC. 9. That all Acts or parts of Acts in any way in-
6 consistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed,
7 and this Act shall take effect on its passage.

8 SEC. 10. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid
9 Highway Act of 1952".

82ND CONGRESS
2^D Session

H. R. 7340

[Report No. 1730]

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

By Mr. BUCKLEY

APRIL 1, 1952

Referred to the Committee on Public Works

APRIL 8, 1952

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued April 23, 1952

For actions of April 22, 1952

82nd-2nd, No. 67

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....1,2,3	Flood relief.....2	Plant seizure.....1
Arbor Day.....26	Foreign trade.....29	Prices.....30
Cotton.....33	Forestry.....25	Puerto Rico.....12,21
Dairy industry.....8,31	Import controls.....6,17	Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....11
Defense Production Act.....29,31	Lands, grazing.....16	Retirement.....7
Electrification.....14,24	Lands, public.....13	Road authorizations....6
Farm cooperatives.....32	Loans, farm.....22	St. Lawrence Waterway.....4,23
Farm program.....10	Mineral rights.....20	Technical assistance...27
Flood control.....9,15,18,28	Nomination.....5	
	Personnel.....1,7,19	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed 3rd supplemental appropriation bill. Both Houses passed \$25 million appropriation for disaster relief. Ready for President. Senate committees reported Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill and St. Lawrence waterway measure. Senate committee reported nomination of Andrews to TCA. Senate committee ordered reported road-authorization bill.

SENATE

1. **THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952.** Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 6947 (pp. 4247-52, 4254-67).

Sens. McKellar, Hayden, Russell, McCarran, O'Mahoney, Bridges, Ferguson, Cordon, and Saltonstall were appointed Senate conferees on the bill (p. 4267).

Agreed to a Johnston amendment to establish a \$6,500,000 revolving fund for Civil Service Commission investigations to be borne by funds of the departments and agencies (pp. 4247-9).

Agreed to a Hayden amendment to strike out the provision cutting the pay-cost items in Chapter 11 by 10% in the case of most departments (including USDA) and 1% in the case of the Post Office Department. Then agreed to a Ferguson amendment to cut the other pay-cost items in the bill (that is, those not in Chapter 11) by 10%. The purpose of these two actions was to provide for conference committee consideration of all of the pay-cost items. (pp. 4249-52, 4254.)

Agreed to a Bridges amendment decreasing the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands by \$300,000 in view of anticipated receipts of that amount (pp. 4261-5).

Rejected, 47-29 (two-thirds vote required), a Ferguson amendment prohibiting use of any 1952 appropriations in connection with any plant seizure (pp. 4254-61).

2. **FLOOD RELIEF.** Both Houses passed without amendment H. J. Res. 427, to appropriate \$25,000,000 additional for flood relief in the Missouri Basin (pp. 4281-4, 4302; 4267-9, 4235-8, 4265-7). This measure will now be sent to the President.

3. TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments this bill, H. R. 6854 (S. Rept. 1464) (p. 4240).
4. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. The Foreign Relations Committee rejected, by a 6-6 vote, a motion to report favorably S. J. Res. 27, to authorize this project. It then voted, 9-4, to report the measure without recommendation. (pp. 4240, D359.) Sen. Lehman inserted a letter from the President favoring the project (p. 4244).
5. NOMINATION. The Foreign Relations Committee reported favorably the nomination of Stanley Andrews to be Technical Cooperation Administrator (p. 4241).
6. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. The Roads Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee voted to report favorably to the full committee, with amendments, S. 2437, to authorize appropriations for roads in the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 (p. D359).
7. CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee ordered reported with amendments S. 2968, to increase the annuities of retirees up to \$324 annually. It is understood that the revised bill provides that the increase would be temporary (through June 1954) and that a continued increase beyond that time would have to be provided by specific appropriation instead of being financed from the retirement fund. (p. D359.)
8. IMPORT CONTROLS. Sen. Wiley spoke in favor of retaining import controls on dairy products (pp. 4239-40).
9. FLOOD CONTROL. Sen. Butler, Nebr., spoke in favor of additional flood control (pp. 4252-4).
10. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Bridges inserted a list of the President's recommendations which have not been passed by Congress, including various proposals regarding a farm program (pp. 4241-2).
11. RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION. Began debate on S. 515, to amend the RFC Act in a number of particulars so as to clarify its responsibilities and improve its accounting methods and financial structure. Sen. Byrd submitted and discussed his amendment to abolish RFC and transfer its national-defense functions to other agencies. (pp. 4269-75.)

HOUSE

12. PUERTO RICO. Received the President's message transmitting to Congress for approval the Constitution of Puerto Rico; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (H. Doc. 435) (pp. 4291-2).
13. PUBLIC LANDS. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 1631, amended, setting aside the Fort Reno (Okla.) Military Reservation in trust for the Cheyenne-Arapaho Indians (p. D360).
14. ELECTRIFICATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) H. R. 2643, consolidating the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project into the Parker-Davis project (p. D360).
15. FLOOD CONTROL. Received Lowell, Mass. city Clerk's petition requesting that cuts in New England States flood-control program be reinstated (p. 4304).

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued May 7, 1952
For actions of May 6, 1952
82nd-2nd, No. 76

CONTENTS

Commodity Credit Corporation.....9	Lands, transfer,.....1	Road authorizations.....2
Flood control.....10	Personnel.....4	Soil conservation.....1
Forestry.....1	Prices.....8	Water utilization.....7
Fuel resources.....5	Reclamation.....3	Wool.....6

HIGHLIGHTS: House Rules Committee cleared road authorization bill. House committee reported bill to continue ACP.

HOUSE

1. SOIL CONSERVATION; FORESTRY; LAND TRANSFERS. The Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 7639, to continue authority for Federal administration of the Agricultural Conservation Program; H. R. 5314, to authorize transfer of a game experiment station from EPISAE to the University of Calif.; S. 1403, to transfer a tract of Farmers' Home Administration land at Shumaker, Ark., to the Navy Department; S. 1517, to authorize sale, without advertising, of national-forest timber in amounts not over \$2,000; and S. 1630, to increase the width of easements for rights-of-way which may be granted in national forests for electrical transmission, telephone, and telegraph lines and poles (p. D417).
2. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 7340, to authorize appropriations under the Federal-aid Road Act for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 (p. 4911).
3. RECLAMATION. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 2613, to authorize the Collbran reclamation project, Colo. (p. 4911).

SENATE

NOT IN SESSION. Next meeting Wed., May 7.

BILLS INTRODUCED

4. PERSONNEL. H. R. 7737, by Rep. Jackson of Wash., providing that the U. S. shall have a civil action against any person who bribes or attempts to bribe a Government officer or employee; to Judiciary Committee (p. 4935).
5. FUEL RESOURCES. H. Res. 637, by Rep. Dlatnik, directing the Interior Department to report on peat resources and their potential use as fuel; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 4935).

-2-
ITEMS IN APPENDIX

6. WOOL. Rep. D'Ewart inserted an address by Mr. W. Steiwer, President of the National Wool Growers Association, on the importance and needs of the domestic sheep and wool industry (pp. A2857-8).
7. WATER UTILIZATION. Rep. Scudder inserted a Humboldt Times article stating that the Western Mining Council has gone on record as opposing the Bureau of Reclamation's Trinity River diversion project, claiming this would draw water out of one watershed into another (p. A2858).
8. PRICES. Rep. Wolverton inserted a comparative study made by the American Enterprise Association on H. R. 5767, 6925, and 6986 relating to resale price maintenance contracts (pp. A2859-60).
Rep. Wolverton inserted his statement explaining the purpose and effect of the McGuire "fair-trade" bill, H. R. 5767, which would extend the provisions of State "fair-trade" laws to retail merchants not signing minimum resale price agreements with producers or distributors. He compared this bill with the Keogh bill, H. R. 6925, relating to this subject, and explained certain differences in the provisions of these measures. (pp. A2869-70.)
9. COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION. Rep. Boggs inserted a Saturday Evening Post article claiming that the CCC is "a self-contained case study of how waste in government extends its contaminating influence". It also praised Sen. Williams as the "Senate's one-man investigating Bureau." (pp. A2863-4.)
10. FLOOD CONTROL. Speech in the House by Rep. Yerty criticizing the Appropriations Committee for cutting flood control funds for Los Angeles (Calif.) County projects. He inserted a letter and telegram requesting restoration of these funds and a letter from Rep. Kerr explaining the reasons why the appropriations were reduced. (pp. A2875-6.)

ooo

COMMITTEE HEARING ANNOUNCEMENTS for May 7: O&C land jurisdiction, H. Interior (Watts, Mynatt to testify); Clearing-house on Government contractors, H. Judiciary (Holden, Wirin to testify); Civil-works study, H. Public Works (Searles to testify); Defense Production Act extension, H. Banking; Grain-storage investigation, S. Agriculture; Foot-and-mouth disease laboratory, poultry disease, anthrax disease, H. Agriculture (Simms to testify). MAY 8: Independent offices, Interior, civil functions, and Defense appropriation bills, S. Appropriations (ex.); Tuna-fish imports, establishment of Department of Health, S. Government Operations; Foreign aid, H. Foreign Affairs (ex.).

ooo

For supplemental information and copies of legislative material referred to, call Ext. 4654 or send to Room 105A.

ooo

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued May 26, 1952
For actions of May 23, 1952
32nd-2nd, No. 89

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	8,14	Housing.....	9	Potato shortage.....	18
Buildings and grounds.....	20	Immigration.....	5	Price control.....	18
Cheese.....	6	Import control.....	6,15	Price support.....	15,18
Electrification.....	19	Legislative program.....	8	Property management.....	7
Emergency powers.....	10	Livestock.....	17	Roads.....	11
Foreign aid.....	1,13	Loans, housing.....	9	Tobacco.....	4
Forestry.....	11	Personnel.....	2,12,16,21	Veterans' benefits.....	3

HIGHLIGHTS: House passed foreign-aid bill. Senate passed housing bill. Senate committee ordered reported road-authorization bill. President recommended changes in personnel laws.

HOUSE

1. FOREIGN AID. Passed, 245-110, with amendments H. R. 7005, to extend the Mutual Security Program. By a 221-137 vote, adopted the Vorys amendment to reduce economic aid by \$615,300,000. By a 192-165 vote, agreed to a Vorys amendment to cut the authorization for Asia by \$111,000,000 and separate the military authorization from the Point 4 authorization. Also agreed to an amendment to limit the dollar costs for supplies, equipment, and commodities in the technical assistance program. (pp. 5957-6010.)
2. PERSONNEL. Both Houses received a message from the President transmitting the annual report of the Civil Service Commission for the fiscal year 1951 and making legislative recommendations as follows: (1) Modernization of examining and recruitment procedures as provided in S. 1135; (2) authorization for additional super-grade positions; (3) authority for Federal agencies to assign selected personnel to educational institutions and other organizations for professional and technical training; (4) unemployment compensation coverage for Federal employees (pp. 6012, 5953).
3. VETERANS' BENEFITS. Both Houses received a message from the President recommending a complete study of veterans' benefit programs and their relation to social insurance and other general welfare programs (pp. 6012, 5953).
4. TOBACCO. Received from this Department a proposed bill to modify the minimum acreage allotment provisions regarding Burley tobacco; to Agriculture Committee (p. 6016).
5. IMMIGRATION. House conferees were appointed on H. R. 5678, to revise the immigration and naturalization laws (p. 5955). Senate conferees have been appointed.

6. **IMPORT CONTROL.** Rep. Eberharter spoke against Sec. 104 of the Defense Production Act, providing for import controls against cheese, etc. (p. 5955).
7. **PROPERTY MANAGEMENT.** The Expenditures in the Executive Departments Committee submitted a report, "Federal Supply Management (Overseas Survey)" (H. Rept. 1994)(p. 6016).
8. **ADJOURNED** until Mon., May 26 (p. 6014). **LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM** for this week, as announced by the Majority Leader: Mon., D. C. bills; Tues., road-authorization bill; Wed. and Thurs., Puerto Rican constitution and probably emergency-powers continuation; Fri., holiday (p. 5956).

SENATE

9. **HOUSING.** Passed as reported S. 3066, the housing bill, which includes a provision continuing the authorization for USDA housing loans (pp. 5936-9).
10. **EMERGENCY POWERS.** Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 156, extending for 15 more days certain emergency war powers (p. 5936).
11. **ROADS.** The Public Works Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) with clarifying amendments S. 2437, the road authorizations bill, which includes provisions for forest highways and forest development roads and trails (p. D492).
12. **PERSONNEL RETIREMENT.** Discussed and postponed action on S. 2968, amending the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to increase the annuity payments received by retired employees (pp. 5952-3).
13. **FOREIGN AID.** S. 3086, the foreign-aid bill, was made the unfinished business (p. 5950).
14. **RECESSED** until Mon., May 26 (p. 5953).

BILLS INTRODUCED

15. **IMPORT CONTROL; PRICE SUPPORT.** S. 3224, by Sen. Mundt, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, so as to impose a special equalization duty upon agricultural commodities for which price support has been made available and a parity price established; to Finance Committee (p. 5935).
16. **PERSONNEL.** H. R. 7970, by Rep. Mansfield, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to authorize lump-sum payments in lieu of annuities to certain widows of officers and employees to whom such act applies; to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 6017).
H. R. 7971, by Rep. Morrison, to amend section 8 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 6017).
H. R. 7972, by Rep. Morrison, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 6017).
17. **LIVESTOCK.** H. R. 7975, by Rep. Lyle, to amend section 112 (f) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the sale of cattle necessitated by drought conditions shall be deemed an involuntary conversion of property; to Ways and Means Committee (p. 6017).

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued May 27, 1952

For actions of May 26, 1952

82nd-2nd, No. 90

CONTENTS

Anthrax.....6	Farm program.....15	Potato shortage.....8
Appropriations.....14	Fertilizer.....6	Price control.....18
Buildings.....9	Foreign aid.....1,13	Progressive Farmer.....11
Cheese.....7	Forestry.....2,3,19	Purchasing.....14
Credit.....12	Holiday.....10	Road authorizations.....2
Electrification.....17	Import control.....6,7	St. Lawrence seaway.....16
Emergency powers.....4	Personnel.....5	Water utilization.....20

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated foreign-aid bill. Senate committee reported road authorizations bill. House discussed potato shortage.

SENATE

1. FOREIGN AID. Began debate on S. 3086, to authorize continuation of the Mutual Security Program (pp. 6025-52).
2. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. The Public Works Committee reported with amendments S. 2437, to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 for roads, including forest highways and forest roads and trails (S. Rept. 1596) (p. 6020).
3. FORESTRY. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendments S. 2229, to authorize this Department to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain public airports, which are used in connection with forest-fire prevention, near national forests if land within such forests is not suitable for airports (S. Rept. 1598) (p. 6020).

HOUSE

4. EMERGENCY POWERS. Passed without amendment S. J. Res. 156, extending until June 15, 1952, certain emergency war powers (pp. 6060-1). The Judiciary Committee had ordered this measure reported earlier in the day (p. 3500).
5. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment H. R. 7806, to authorize certain Federal employees to attend, without loss of pay or annual leave, funerals for deceased members of Armed Forces returned to this country for burial (H. Rept. 1997) (p. 6096).
6. ANTHRAX; IMPORT CONTROL. Received a Wisconsin State Livestock Sanitation Committee resolution requesting the USDA to prevent importation of bones, bone meal, or bone meal products into this country as feed or fertilizer except when properly processed to kill anthrax spores (p. 6096).

7. CHEESE; IMPORT CONTROL. Rep. Eberharter spoke against Section 104 of the Defense Production Act, restricting imports of cheese, which he claimed will harm domestic agriculture more than it will help it (p. 6060).
8. POTATO SHORTAGE. Various members debated the present white potato shortage and the black market conditions in the potato industry. Rep. McIntire criticized the OPS price ceiling on potatoes as having been invoked with "undue haste" and without careful consideration. (pp. 6076-84.)

BILLS INTRODUCED

9. BUILDINGS. S. 3226, by Sen. Chavez, to amend section 302 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949 so as to increase the authorization for appropriations for carrying out the program for the renovation and improvement of federally owned buildings outside the District of Columbia from \$30,000,000 to \$60,000,000; to Public Works Committee (p. 6020-1).
10. HOLIDAY. H. R. 7992, by Rep. McDonough, to make Flag Day a legal public holiday; to Judiciary Committee (p. 6096).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

11. PROGRESSIVE FARMER. Rep. Jones (Ala.) inserted a newspaper article praising the magazine Progressive Farmer as the "best, well-balanced, honest-to-goodness farm paper in the U. S." (pp. A3365-6).
12. CREDIT. Rep. Harvey inserted three editorials discussing the large number of Federal credit agencies which have arisen in emergencies and claiming that they have "tended to perpetuate and extend themselves" after the emergency period ended. The editorials recommended a gradual consolidation and liquidation of these agencies. (pp. A3371-2.)
13. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Moody inserted a New York Times editorial criticizing the House for slashing the mutual security bill, and urging the Senate to rectify this (pp. A3372-3).
14. PURCHASING; APPROPRIATIONS. Extension of remarks by Rep. Richards clarifying contract limitations of Federal employees under the General Appropriation Act, 1951, pointing out that contracts can only be made if authorized by an appropriation or a specific contract authorization in an appropriation (p. A3394).
15. FARM PROGRAM. Rep. Schoeppel inserted a Topeka Daily Capital article, "State GOP Farm Leaders Adopt Plank," which reported the formation of an agricultural council and the adoption of a 10-point program. One of these proposals is to shift "congressionally delegated policy-making powers over agriculture into the hands of a bipartisan board, rather than the Department of Agriculture." (pp. A3389-90.)
16. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Rep. Van Zandt inserted a labor journal editorial criticizing the methods being used to sell this project to the American people (p. A3390).
17. ELECTRIFICATION. Rep. Miller inserted a Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce letter indorsing the Capohart-Miller bill for the further development of hydro-electric power from the Niagara Falls and River by private enterprise (p. A3394).

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1952—AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONTINUING CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS FOR FISCAL YEARS 1954 AND 1955

MAY 26 (legislative day, MAY 12), 1952.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, submitted
the following

R E P O R T

[To accompany S. 2437]

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2437) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Hearings have been held on S. 2437 over a period of several days in February 1952, at which testimony or statements were received from Members of both Houses of Congress, from Federal, State, and local officials, and various individuals and groups interested in highway development and use. All witnesses were in favor of continuing Federal highway aid in some form, and the majority asked for an increase in Federal participation.

A report on the current Federal-aid highway program and on the relationship of highway transport to the national economy was furnished to the committee by the Commissioner of Public Roads and has been printed in the hearings on this bill. This report, together with testimony presented by the American Association of State Highway Officials and others, shows that highway usage is running far ahead of highway improvements. The capacity of our highway system is diminishing due to deterioration of older roads without sufficient replacement or reconstruction to compensate for the loss. On the other hand, not only are we failing to keep up with obsolescence,

but we are also making no progress in meeting the increasing demands upon the highway system generally. The data show that highway usage has increased at about the same rate as the expansion of the national economy. This parallel relationship of highway transportation to national production emphasizes the fact that our highways have become a great influence in the Nation's economy. The importance of the highway network to the economy of all parts of the Nation remains undisputed.

Federal highway aid has repaid ample dividends not only from its direct financial contribution to highway construction, but also in furnishing the stimulus and encouragement which have helped to produce generally uniform highway development throughout the Nation by State and local governments without any direct Federal aid. It should be made clear that the major burden of financing our highway network rests upon the State and local governments. The Federal contribution amounts to only a relatively small portion of the total annual expenditures for highway improvements by all levels of government. In 1950, the Federal contribution was 11.9 percent of the total expenditures; in 1951, it was 10.7 percent. The Federal part in this highway development partnership has led to greater uniformity in highway construction, the knitting together of the main lines which form the principal interstate routes, the coordinated development of the secondary and local roads which feed into the through roads, and emphasis upon the strategic roads which are so vital to national defense. Without the impetus stimulated by Federal participation, highway development would have been influenced mostly by local and sectional interests without regard to the advantages of interstate and national cooperation as was the experience prior to the adoption of Federal participation.

All of the Federal-aid funds authorized under existing law have been apportioned to the States and the programing of the work by the States is proceeding ahead of the time period allowed for the current authorization. The legislatures of 45 States will meet in their regular biennial sessions early next year. Since the States make the necessary financial arrangements for their highway programs, including the matching of Federal-aid funds at their legislative sessions, it is imperative that Federal-aid legislation be acted upon at the present session of Congress for an additional 2-year period so that the States may be able to coordinate their programs with the Federal-aid authorizations and provide for orderly continuation of this vital element of our national economy.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR FEDERAL-AID SYSTEMS

The bill as reported by the committee continues the Federal-Aid highway program for an additional 2-year period under substantially the same basic pattern as heretofore adopted by Congress. The annual amount for the three regular Federal-aid systems was set at a total of \$600,000,000, which compares with a total of \$500,000,000 per year under the current authorization. This is an increase of 20 percent, which is substantially the same as the rise in price levels subsequent to the enactment of the current authorizations. Thus, the bill will provide for only the same amount of highway construction if

price levels remain stable, and if they should continue to rise it will not provide for as much construction as the current program.

In agreeing upon this amount, the committee was mindful of the fact that it will not stimulate any forward progress in taking care of the increased highway demands of the country. The committee also recognizes that the Federal Government is requiring payment of revenue from highway users far in excess of the annual Federal-aid contributions. In 1951, Federal tax revenues on gasoline and lubricating oils alone totaled \$694,000,000 and the tax on automobiles, trucks, accessories, and tires totaled an additional \$1,005,000,000. In 1952 these Federal road-user taxes will run considerably higher since the tax rate has been increased nearly one-third. Taking these factors into consideration, the committee feels that the amounts recommended in the bill as amended are the minimum which should be provided to prevent further deterioration of our highway facilities in the face of a rapidly increasing demand for more adequate highways resulting in large measure from defense-connected activities.

The division of the recommended authorization among the three systems is in accordance with the distribution ratios previously adopted by Congress. The amounts recommended for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 are as follows:

- (a) \$270,000,000 (45 percent) for the primary system.
- (b) \$180,000,000 (30 percent) for the secondary system.
- (c) \$150,000,000 (25 percent) for the urban system.

The apportionment of the above amounts among the States will be on the same basis as provided under existing law. A table listing the approximate apportionment is shown at the end of this report.

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

This is a system designated in accordance with section 7 of the 1944 Federal-Aid Highway Act consisting of not to exceed 40,000 miles of roads selected so as to connect the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industries, and to serve the national defense. It is in effect a network of the most important arteries of interstate highway transportation carved out of the primary and urban systems and, because it lies wholly within the latter two systems, it is eligible to receive Federal aid from both the primary and urban funds. In recent years as much as 34 percent of Federal-aid primary funds and 46 percent of urban funds have been used on portions of the interstate system. Hitherto, that has been the only source of Federal aid for the interstate system. No funds have been earmarked or authorized exclusively for that system.

Several witnesses, including representatives of the State highway officials, testified as to the need for stepping up the work on the interstate system both as a defense measure and to keep up with the increasing demands of the national economy. It was brought out that this system is the backbone of the highway facilities which would bear the great burden of heavy defense traffic during any full-scale war emergency. Even during the existing limited emergency, the system has already been subjected to severe stress from defense loads. The committee believes that it is time to place more emphasis on improvement of the interstate system in order to prevent the risk

of seriously impairing the capability of the system to carry vital defense traffic. It has therefore recommended an authorization of \$50,000,000 to be applied exclusively to the interstate system. It will be apportioned to the States in the same manner as the funds for the primary system and will be subject to the same matching provisions as heretofore required for the Federal-aid systems. This authorization will be additional to and not in substitution for the portions of the primary and urban funds which would normally be used for parts of the interstate system under the usual programming of Federal-aid projects by the States. A table showing the approximate apportionments by States is shown at the end of this report.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS BETWEEN SYSTEMS

The bill as introduced contained a provision that would permit the interchange of not more than 25 percent of the funds authorized for the primary and secondary systems when requested and certified as being in the public interest by the State highway department and approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads. The committee heard testimony both in favor of, and opposed to, this interchange provision. Supporters of the provision claimed that it would permit flexibility and better use of the funds. Opponents felt that it would operate mainly to the disadvantage of the secondary system and thus circumvent the division of funds among the Federal-aid systems which was adopted by Congress after proper consideration of the needs of all systems. The committee feels that it would be unwise to take action which might result in disturbing the balance of apportionment among the systems and might easily work to the disadvantage of either system contrary to the intent of Congress when it established a definite ratio of division among the three systems. Accordingly, that provision has been stricken from the bill.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY AND RAMA ROAD

The committee received testimony concerning the continuation of participation by the United States in the development of the Inter-American Highway and completion of work on the Rama Road in Nicaragua pursuant to an agreement with that country. The testimony included statements on the progress of the work and its effect in promoting both friendly relations and commerce between the United States and the countries of Central America. On the Inter-American Highway, about 1,600 miles of road extending all the way across Mexico from the United States to the Guatemalan border have been completed by Mexico entirely at its own expense. The 1,500-mile stretch from the Mexico-Guatemala border to Panama is the section in which the United States has participated pursuant to legislation first enacted by Congress in 1941. About 1,200 miles of this highway have been opened up since that date with matching funds of the Central American countries and appropriations of about \$36,000,000 in United States funds. About 280 miles of the route remain to be constructed consisting mainly of gaps in Guatemala, Costa Rica, and Panama located in terrain which involves difficult and costly construction. It is estimated that about \$56,000,000 in United States funds, together with the matching funds as required

by existing law, will be needed to complete these gaps and to finish up the surfacing of other reaches of the highway. The committee is in agreement that continued participation of the United States in the completion of this highway is warranted by its contribution to the promotion of economic progress, political stability, and security of these neighboring countries in our own hemisphere. For similar reasons, and for the further purpose of fulfilling diplomatic obligations entered into several years ago, the committee approves the provisions in the bill authorizing the completion of the Rama Road in Nicaragua, part of which has previously been built with United States assistance.

EMERGENCY FUND

The section in the bill dealing with emergency repair work on Federal-aid roads damaged by floods or other disasters has been rewritten by the committee so as to give it the status of a stand-by fund in the amount of \$15,000,000, which would be available for expenditure without further legislative action other than appropriation of the initial fund and its replenishment on an annual basis. This will permit the Commissioner of Public Roads to proceed promptly when disasters occur and it will avoid any delay in carrying out the emergency work such as could happen due to time-consuming procedures in obtaining separate legislative authority whenever the hitherto limited emergency fund should become exhausted. The new language retains the previously adopted requirements with respect to matching of funds and declaration of an emergency by the Governor of the State affected.

DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS

The committee studied extensive information concerning authorization needs for defense and access roads. It found considerable variation in the views of different executive agencies on this subject. It considered also two proposed amendments relating to this subject which would provide authorization for circumferential and radial roads generally in the interest of civil defense. One view received from an executive agency was to the effect that this matter could better be considered in separate legislation after further data on the needs of the program are obtained. Other views indicated that additional needs do now exist and various estimates were mentioned, including a sizable program of timber access roads as well as roads for access to mineral sources, industrial plants, and other defense installations.

When the committee brought up the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for consideration in the Senate, it was prevailed upon by the executive department to reduce the modest authorization which it had recommended in the bill for defense access roads. It acceded to that request. Shortly afterward our country was involved in the Korean action, and the executive department hastily called upon Congress for additional authorizations for defense access roads.

In view of that experience, the committee has studied thoroughly the various differing views expressed in the course of the hearings and has concluded that the existing authorizations should be increased sufficiently to take care of the best estimates of needs that can be determined at this time with a reasonable allowance for future needs

as reflected by the data obtained at the hearings. It has therefore recommended an additional authorization of \$50,000,000 for this program and has included a provision permitting the use of the funds for circumferential or radial intracity routes when certified as being important for civilian or military defense. Under existing law the Commissioner of Public Roads may pay all or any part of the cost of defense access roads with Federal funds. In accordance with the policy previously expressed by Congress, the Commissioner exercises the discretionary authority to establish the amount of State matching by negotiation on the merits and circumstances of each particular project proposed. During World War II the actual experience resulted in an average matching of about 74-percent Federal funds to 26-percent State or local funds. The committee understands that the Commissioner is following the same procedure under the existing authorization which this bill proposes to extend, and will expect him to apply it to the enlarged provisions of this act.

ROADS ON FEDERAL LANDS

The authorizations for roads on Federal lands and Indian lands, such as national parks, forests, Indian reservations, and other public lands, follow the same general pattern as heretofore adopted by Congress. The amounts for forest highways, roads and trails, and Indian roads have been increased above current annual authorizations only slightly more than would be necessary to make up for the rise in price levels. The evidence was clear that continuation of these programs at no less than their current levels is in the public interest. The other programs have been kept at, or slightly below, the amounts of their current authorizations, which represents a cut in the progress of this work due to the price increases.

LOCAL AND SECONDARY ROADS

In the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 the Congress adopted certain modifications of the law pertaining to the administration of the secondary-roads program and its application and treatment of local rural roads. Preliminary reports on the effects of these modifications are encouraging. The language of the modifications is not repeated in this bill since it was the intent of the committee that as written in the 1950 act the modifications would constitute permanent legislation so long as no action to the contrary is taken by Congress. To remove any possible doubt concerning this matter, as well as other provisions in previous acts, the committee has included language in section 12 carrying forward the provisions of the 1944, 1948, and 1950 acts which are not inconsistent with this bill.

TIMBER-ACCESS ROADS

In setting the amount of the authorization for forest roads and trails, the committee increased the current amount of \$17,500,000 to \$22,500,000 per year. This action was taken by the committee with the understanding that at least the amount of the increase, \$5,000,000 per year, will be applied to timber-access roads to open up new bodies of timber for which there exists a strong demand at favorable prices.

It was learned that there are large bodies of timber in national forests, particularly in the West, that are untapped by access roads. It is very desirable from the standpoint of securing a good economic return as well as in the interest of sound forestry practice to open up these stands of timber and harvest them on a sustained-yield basis.

SENATE BILL 2585

The committee also heard testimony on Senate bill 2585, the provisions of which were proposed to be included in Senate bill 2437. The purpose of Senate bill 2585 was to provide for payment wholly at Federal expense of the entire cost of relocation and readjustment of utility facilities necessitated by the construction or reconstruction of Federal-aid highways. The committee received many conflicting views on this subject. It was evident that this is a serious problem with which the committee has a great deal of sympathy. It was also clear that it is a very complex matter the full effects of which cannot be reliably determined without further extensive study. The committee has therefore passed over this proposal without prejudice and it feels that it should be made the subject of separate study and hearings on its own merits when more detailed data can be obtained.

An analysis of the bill as recommended is as follows:

Section 1

Section 1 of the bill authorizes the appropriation of \$600,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955. The sum authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure on the same percentage basis as provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944, 1948, and 1950. The division between the highway classifications is as follows: \$270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system; \$180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary system; and \$150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid urban system.

The bill provides that the sums apportioned to each State under this section shall be available for expenditure for 18 months after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized. The period of availability is now 2 years. Prior to World War II it was 1 year. Curtailing the period to 18 months will tend to discourage any lagging in the highway program under the current conditions of many highway deficiencies.

Section 2

Section 2 would authorize the appropriation of the additional sum of \$50,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 for expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of the national system of interstate highways. The sum authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the States in the same manner now prescribed for the apportionment of Federal-aid primary funds, and the Federal share payable to any project constructed with these funds would be the same as for projects constructed with such Federal-aid primary funds.

Section 3

This section authorizes an appropriation of \$25,000,000 for forest highways for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, and \$22,500,000 for forest development roads and trails for the same period.

Section 4

Section 4 (a) provides an authorization of \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, for construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads, trails, and bridges in national parks and monuments and approach roads thereto, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments. The committee has eliminated "maintenance" from the work proposed to be accomplished with these funds, as it is believed that the present cost of about \$4,000,000 annually for maintenance of these roads should rest on the general authorization to maintain Government property, rather than to be obtained from construction funds.

Section 4 (b) would authorize \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, for construction and maintenance of authorized parkways.

Section 4 (c) would authorize \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, for construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and bridges within Indian reservations and to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands.

Section 5

This section would authorize an appropriation of \$8,000,000 annually for a period of 7 years, fiscal years 1953 to 1959, inclusive, for completion of the Inter-American Highway as a land artery from the United States, through Mexico and the Central American Republics to the Panama Canal. The funds would be used on a matching basis, except that one-third of the appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring that it be matched, if the Secretary of State should find that the cost of construction of the highway is beyond the reasonable capacity of any country or countries to bear.

Section 6

Section 6 provides an authorization of \$8,000,000 for the completion of the road between San Benito and Rama in the Republic of Nicaragua, and for completion of a survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff. The funds provided under this section require no matching by the Republic of Nicaragua.

Section 7

Section 7 would authorize establishment of an emergency fund of \$15,000,000 for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on any of the Federal-aid highway systems damaged or destroyed by floods, landslides, or other catastrophes of nature. Replenishment of the fund on an annual basis is authorized, and pending appropriation of the initial fund, or its replenishment, the Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to expend from available Federal-aid funds such sums as may be necessary for immediate use on work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the emergency fund. Federal funds used under this section would not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the repair or reconstruction project.

Section 8

This section provides authorization of \$2,500,000 for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 for completing sections of important Federal-aid highways lying entirely within the public domain.

Section 9

Section 9 would authorize and direct the Commissioner of Public Roads to assist in carrying out the program of the President's highway safety conference, and to cooperate with the State highway departments and other agencies in promoting highway safety. Expenditures would be limited to \$100,000 from the administrative funds of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Section 10

Section 10 of the bill would authorize the additional sum of \$50,000,000 for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended, for construction and improvement of roads and highways certified as essential for civilian or military defense, including access roads to timber and other sources of raw materials, and circumferential or radial highways around, in, or adjacent to cities.

Section 11

Section 11 provides that all provisions of the Federal-aid Highway Acts of 1944, 1948, and 1950, not inconsistent with the provisions of this bill, shall remain in full force and effect.

Section 12

Section 12 provides that if any section, subsection, or other provision of the bill, or the application to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the validity of the remainder thereof.

Section 13

Section 13 provides for the repeal of all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the bill, and that the bill shall take effect on its passage.

Section 14

Section 14 provides that the act may be cited as the "Federal-aid Highway Act of 1952."

Approximate apportionment of Federal-aid highway funds (pursuant to S. 2437)

State	Primary (\$270,000,000)	Secondary (\$180,000,000)	Urban (\$150,000,000)	Total (\$600,000,000)
Alabama.....	\$5,602,000	\$4,346,000	\$1,903,000	\$11,851,000
Arizona.....	3,954,000	2,692,000	565,000	7,211,000
Arkansas.....	4,392,000	3,518,000	813,000	8,723,000
California.....	12,193,000	6,280,000	12,914,000	31,387,000
Colorado.....	4,786,000	3,196,000	1,207,000	9,189,000
Connecticut.....	1,682,000	866,000	2,813,000	5,361,000
Delaware.....	1,299,000	866,000	298,000	2,463,000
Florida.....	4,216,000	2,755,000	2,605,000	9,576,000
Georgia.....	6,589,000	5,029,000	2,117,000	13,735,000
Idaho.....	3,285,000	2,309,000	280,000	5,874,000
Illinois.....	10,222,000	5,566,000	10,160,000	25,948,000
Indiana.....	6,298,000	4,340,000	3,475,000	14,113,000
Iowa.....	6,452,000	4,718,000	1,725,000	12,895,000
Kansas.....	6,485,000	4,538,000	1,365,000	12,388,000
Kentucky.....	4,875,000	4,049,000	1,509,000	10,433,000
Louisiana.....	4,097,000	2,967,000	2,129,000	9,193,000
Maine.....	2,237,000	1,600,000	607,000	4,444,000
Maryland.....	2,322,000	1,419,000	2,465,000	6,206,000
Massachusetts.....	3,340,000	1,232,000	6,047,000	10,619,000
Michigan.....	8,253,000	5,036,000	6,761,000	20,050,000
Minnesota.....	6,987,000	4,927,000	2,366,000	14,280,000
Mississippi.....	4,736,000	3,945,000	804,000	9,485,000
Missouri.....	7,643,000	5,171,000	3,578,000	16,392,000
Montana.....	5,371,000	3,693,000	342,000	9,406,000
Nebraska.....	5,154,000	3,655,000	852,000	9,661,000
Nevada.....	3,436,000	2,296,000	111,000	5,843,000
New Hampshire.....	1,299,000	866,000	421,000	2,586,000
New Jersey.....	3,439,000	1,161,000	6,359,000	10,959,000
New Mexico.....	4,342,000	2,982,000	477,000	7,801,000
New York.....	12,460,000	4,991,000	19,418,000	36,869,000
North Carolina.....	6,540,000	5,592,000	1,867,000	13,999,000
North Dakota.....	3,871,000	2,809,000	246,000	6,926,000
Ohio.....	9,236,000	5,617,000	8,407,000	23,260,000
Oklahoma.....	5,691,000	4,074,000	1,587,000	11,352,000
Oregon.....	4,558,000	3,184,000	1,165,000	8,907,000
Pennsylvania.....	10,416,000	6,199,000	10,998,000	27,613,000
Rhode Island.....	1,299,000	866,000	1,038,000	3,203,000
South Carolina.....	3,583,000	2,964,000	999,000	7,546,000
South Dakota.....	4,142,000	2,958,000	282,000	7,382,000
Tennessee.....	5,654,000	4,417,000	2,101,000	12,172,000
Texas.....	17,166,000	11,493,000	6,960,000	35,619,000
Utah.....	3,049,000	2,017,000	616,000	5,682,000
Vermont.....	1,299,000	866,000	226,000	2,391,000
Virginia.....	5,045,000	3,920,000	2,265,000	11,230,000
Washington.....	4,400,000	2,939,000	2,192,000	9,531,000
West Virginia.....	2,892,000	2,517,000	945,000	6,354,000
Wisconsin.....	6,306,000	4,398,000	2,845,000	13,549,000
Wyoming.....	3,309,000	2,242,000	158,000	5,709,000
Hawaii.....	1,299,000	866,000	488,000	2,653,000
District of Columbia.....	1,299,000	866,000	1,255,000	3,420,000
Puerto Rico.....	1,375,000	1,437,000	1,249,000	4,061,000

Approximate apportionment of \$50,000,000 for the national system of interstate highways (in accordance with the provisions of sec. 21 of the Federal Highway Act of 1921)

State	Amount	State	Amount	State	Amount
Alabama.....	\$1,048,000	Maryland.....	\$435,000	Oklahoma.....	\$1,065,000
Arizona.....	740,000	Massachusetts.....	625,000	Oregon.....	853,000
Arkansas.....	822,000	Michigan.....	1,545,000	Pennsylvania.....	1,949,000
California.....	2,282,000	Minnesota.....	1,308,000	Rhode Island.....	241,000
Colorado.....	896,000	Mississippi.....	886,000	South Carolina.....	671,000
Connecticut.....	315,000	Missouri.....	1,430,000	South Dakota.....	775,000
Delaware.....	241,000	Montana.....	1,005,000	Tennessee.....	1,058,000
Florida.....	789,000	Nebraska.....	965,000	Texas.....	3,213,000
Georgia.....	1,233,000	Nevada.....	643,000	Utah.....	571,000
Idaho.....	615,000	New Hampshire.....	241,000	Vermont.....	241,000
Illinois.....	1,913,000	New Jersey.....	644,000	Virginia.....	944,000
Indiana.....	1,179,000	New Mexico.....	813,000	Washington.....	823,000
Iowa.....	1,207,000	New York.....	2,332,000	West Virginia.....	541,000
Kansas.....	1,214,000	North Carolina.....	1,224,000	Wisconsin.....	1,180,000
Kentucky.....	912,000	North Dakota.....	724,000	Wyoming.....	619,000
Louisiana.....	767,000	Ohio.....	1,728,000	District of Columbia.....	241,000
Maine.....	419,000				

Calendar No. 1526

82D CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 2437

[Report No. 1596]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

JANUARY 16 (legislative day, JANUARY 10), 1952

Mr. CHAVEZ introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Public Works

MAY 26 (legislative day, MAY 12), 1952

Reported by Mr. CHAVEZ, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the
4 Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat.
5 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary
6 thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
7 sum of \$600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

1 The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be
2 available for expenditure as follows:

3 (a) \$270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
4 highway system.

5 (b) \$180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
6 secondary highway system.

7 (c) \$150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid
8 highway system in urban areas.

9 The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year,
10 respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States
11 in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with
12 the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid High-
13 way Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat.
14 838) ~~÷ Provided, That not more than 25 per centum of the~~
15 amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure
16 on the Federal-aid highway system or on the Federal-aid
17 secondary highway system, respectively, may be transferred
18 from the Federal-aid highway system for expenditure on the
19 Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-
20 aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Fed-
21 eral-aid highway system when such transfer is requested and
22 certified as being in the public interest by the State highway
23 department and is approved by the Commissioner of Public
24 Roads.

1 Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision
2 of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State
3 for eighteen months after the close of the fiscal year for which
4 such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned
5 remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse:
6 *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed
7 to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums
8 apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by
9 formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public Roads
10 for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this
11 Act.

12 *SEC. 2. For the purpose of expediting the construction,*
13 *reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary*
14 *bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate high-*
15 *ways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section*
16 *7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838),*
17 *there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional*
18 *sum of \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954,*
19 *and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,*
20 *1955. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall*
21 *be apportioned among the several States in the manner now*
22 *provided by law for the apportionment of Federal-aid pri-*
23 *mary funds: Provided, That the Federal share payable on*
24 *account of any project provided for by funds made available*

1 under the provisions of this section shall be determined in the
 2 same manner as now provided by law for projects on said
 3 Federal-aid primary system.

4 SEC. 2 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
 5 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act, (42 Stat. 218), as
 6 amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be
 7 appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of ~~\$32,000,-~~
 8 ~~000~~ \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954,
 9 and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955;
 10 and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of
 11 ~~\$28,000,000~~ \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June
 12 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
 13 1955: *Provided*, That the appropriation herein authorized
 14 for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of
 15 Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and
 16 Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of
 17 the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

18 SEC. 3 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and
 19 improvement, ~~and maintenance~~ of roads and trails, inclusive
 20 of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and
 21 other areas administered by the National Park Service,
 22 including areas authorized to be established as national parks
 23 and monuments, and national park and monument approach
 24 roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat.
 25 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appro-

1 priated the sum of ~~\$16,000,000~~ \$10,000,000 for the fiscal
2 year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal
3 year ending June 30, 1955.

4 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement,
5 and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Con-
6 gress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States,
7 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of
8 ~~\$17,000,000~~ \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June
9 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June
10 30, 1955.

11 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
12 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
13 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
14 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26,
15 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be ap-
16 propriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending
17 June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending
18 June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the location, type, and
19 design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved
20 by the Commissioner of Public Roads before any expendi-
21 tures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be
22 under the general supervision of the Commissioner of Public
23 Roads.

24 SEC. 4 5. ~~Section~~ *For the purpose of carrying out the*

1 *provisions of section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to pro-*
2 *vide for cooperation with Central American Republics in*
3 *the construction of the Inter-American Highway", approved*
4 *December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), is hereby amended to*
5 *read as follows: as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid*
6 *Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64*
7 *Stat. 785), "There there is hereby authorized to be appro-*
8 *priated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the*
9 *sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953,*
10 *and a like sum for each fiscal year thereafter up to and*
11 *including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, to be avail-*
12 *able until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate*
13 *with the Governments of the American Republics situated*
14 *in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Re-*
15 *publics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras,*
16 *Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and completion of*
17 *construction of the Inter-American Highway within the*
18 *borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to ex-*
19 *ceed \$3,000,000 one-third of the appropriation authorized for*
20 *each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the*
21 *country or countries in which such sums may be expended*
22 *to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find*
23 *that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or*
24 *countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear.*
25 *The expenditures authorized by this section shall be made*

1 in accordance with all provisions and limitations in section 14
2 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950."

3 SEC. 5 6. Recognizing the mutual benefits that will
4 accrue to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States
5 from the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in
6 said Republic of Nicaragua, the construction of which road
7 was begun and partially completed pursuant to an agreement
8 between said Republic and the United States, there is hereby
9 authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$8,000,000
10 for completing the construction of such road, to be available
11 until expended. No expenditure shall be made hereunder
12 for the construction of said road until a request therefor
13 shall have been received by the Secretary of State from the
14 Government of the Republic of Nicaragua nor until an agree-
15 ment shall have been entered into by said Republic with
16 the Secretary of State which shall provide, in part, that said
17 Republic—

18 (1) will provide, without participation of funds
19 herein authorized, all necessary right-of-way for the
20 construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall
21 be of a minimum width *where practicable* of one
22 hundred meters in rural areas and fifty meters in munici-
23 palities and shall forever be held inviolate as a part of
24 the highway for public use;

25 (2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit

1 any such toll to be charged, for the use of said highway
2 by vehicles or persons;

3 (3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly,
4 any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of said road
5 by vehicles or persons from the United States that does
6 not apply equally to vehicles or persons of such
7 Republic;

8 (4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of
9 vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance
10 with the provision of the Convention for the Regulation
11 of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened
12 for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington
13 on December ~~14~~ 15, 1943, and to which such Republic
14 and the United States are parties *or any other treaty or*
15 *international convention establishing similar reciprocal*
16 *recognition*; and

17 (5) will maintain said road after its completion in
18 proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present
19 and future traffic.

20 (b) The funds appropriated pursuant to this authoriza-
21 tion shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the
22 terms of this Act for the survey and construction of the said
23 road from San Benito to Rama, *and for a survey but not*
24 *for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff* in
25 the Republic of Nicaragua without being matched by said

1 Republic, and all expenditures made under the provisions
2 of this Act for materials, equipment, and supplies, shall,
3 whenever practicable, be made for products of the United
4 States or of the Republic of Nicaragua.

5 ~~SEC. 6. Not to exceed \$15,000,000 of any money here-~~
6 ~~before or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accord-~~
7 ~~ance with the provision of the Federal Highway Act, as~~
8 ~~amended and supplemented, shall be available for expendi-~~
9 ~~ture by the Commissioner of Public Roads in accordance~~
10 ~~with the provision of section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway~~
11 ~~Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785) as an emergency relief fund.~~

12 *SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund*
13 *in the amount of \$15,000,000 for expenditure by the Com-*
14 *missioner of Public Roads, in accordance with the provisions*
15 *of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supple-*
16 *mented, after receipt of an application therefor from the*
17 *highway department of any State, in the repair or recon-*
18 *struction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid high-*
19 *way systems, which he shall find have suffered serious damage*
20 *as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods,*
21 *hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, land-*
22 *slides, or other catastrophes in any part of the United States.*
23 *The appropriation of such moneys as may be necessary for*
24 *the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenish-*
25 *ment on an annual basis is hereby authorized: Provided,*

1 *That, pending the appropriation of said sum, or its replenish-*
2 *ment, the Commissioner of Public Roads may expend, from*
3 *existing Federal-aid highway appropriations, such sums as*
4 *may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work*
5 *herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from*
6 *the appropriation herein authorized when made: Provided*
7 *further, That no expenditures shall be made hereunder with*
8 *respect to any such catastrophe in any State unless an emer-*
9 *gency has been declared by the Governor of such State and*
10 *concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce: And provided*
11 *further, That the Federal share payable on account of any*
12 *repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made*
13 *available under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum*
14 *of the cost thereof.*

15 SEC. 7 8. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
16 of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64
17 Stat. 785) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated
18 for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance
19 of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public
20 lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations
21 the sum of ~~\$5,000,000~~ \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year end-
22 ing June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year end-
23 ing June 30, 1955, to remain available until expended.

24 SEC. 8 9. The Commissioner of Public Roads is author-
25 ized and directed to assist in carrying out the action program

1 of the President's Highway Safety Conference and to cooper-
2 ate with the State highway departments and other agencies in
3 this program to advance the cause of safety on the streets and
4 highways: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$100,000 shall be
5 expended annually for the purposes of this section.

6 ~~SEC. 9. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of~~
7 ~~section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat.~~
8 ~~765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid High-~~
9 ~~way Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized~~
10 ~~to be appropriated the additional sum of \$150,000,000 to~~
11 ~~remain available until expended.~~

12 *SEC. 10. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions*
13 *of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat.*
14 *765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid High-*
15 *way Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), as amended, there is hereby*
16 *authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$50,-*
17 *000,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That*
18 *whenever any project for the construction or improvement of*
19 *a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial*
20 *intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by*
21 *the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the Presi-*
22 *dent may designate, as being important for civilian or military*
23 *defense, such project may be constructed under the authoriza-*
24 *tion in this section and in accordance with the conditions*
25 *contained therein.*

1 *SEC. 11. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway*
2 *Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838);*
3 *the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29,*
4 *1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act*
5 *of 1950, approved September 7, 1950, not inconsistent with*
6 *this Act, shall remain in full force and effect.*

7 ~~SEC. 10~~ 12. If any section, subsection, or other pro-
8 vision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or
9 circumstance is held invalid. the remainder of this Act and
10 the application of such section, subsection, or other provision
11 to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected
12 thereby.

13 ~~SEC. 11~~ 13. That all Acts or parts of Acts in any way
14 inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby re-
15 pealed, and this Act shall take effect on its passage.

16 ~~SEC. 12~~ 14. This Act may be cited as the Federal-Aid
17 Highway Act of 1952.

A BILL

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

By Mr. CHAVEZ

JANUARY 16 (legislative day, JANUARY 10), 1952
Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Public Works

MAY 26 (legislative day, MAY 12), 1952
Reported with amendments

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued May 28, 1952

For actions of May 27, 1952

82nd-2nd, No. 91

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	9,27	Forestry.....	1,26	Price support.....	2
Cotton.....	2	Housing, rural.....	29	Puerto Rico.....	10
Defense production.....	7,16	Import control.....	3	Reclamation.....	13,23
Electrification....	5,19,20,23	Irrigation.....	11	Road authorizations.....	1
Expenditures.....	22	Lands, farm.....	14	Soil conservation.....	24
Farm organization.....	25	Newsprint.....	15	Taxation.....	22,26
Farm program.....	21	Nomination.....	8	Territories.....	14
Flood control.....	13	Personnel.....	17	Tobacco.....	12
Food production.....	4	Potato shortage.....	18	Trade, foreign.....	28
Foreign aid.....	6				

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated foreign-aid bill. Senate committee reported bill extending Defense Production Act. Senate subcommittee ordered agricultural appropriation bill reported to full committee. House debated road authorization bill. House Rules Committee cleared bill increasing cotton price supports in case of surplus. Rep. Lane submitted resolution to investigate potato shortage.

HOUSE

- ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS.** Began debate on H. R. 7340, to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 for Federal aid in road construction, including forest highways and forest roads and trails (pp. 6137-66).
- COTTON PRICE SUPPORTS.** The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 5713, which would make Low Middling seven-eighths-inch cotton the standard grade for purposes of parity and price support on the 1952 crop if anytime during the calendar year 1952 the USDA officially estimates the production of cotton in 1952 at 16,000,000 bales or more (p. 6167).
- IMPORT CONTROL.** Rep. Eberharter spoke against the import-control provision of the Defense Production Act (p. 6134).
- FOOD PRODUCTION.** Rep. Carnahan commended scientific and related developments which have increased food production during the last few years (pp. 6177-8).
- ELECTRIFICATION.** Rep. McCormack inserted President Truman's speech before the Electric Consumers Conference defending the Government's power program (pp. 6136-7).
Rep. Dondero urged investigation of the Electric Consumers Conference (pp. 6178-9). Rep. Bow also criticized the Conference (pp. 6179-80).

SENATE

- FOREIGN AID.** Continued debate on S. 3086, to extend the Mutual Security Program for fiscal year 1953, rejecting by 27 yeas to 35 nays a Walker amendment reducing authorized appropriations by \$1 billion (pp. 6102-27).

Sen. Smith, N. J., inserted a New York Times article by Arthur Krock discussing some of the impulses behind the economy drive on the mutual security bill (pp. 6101-2).

7. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendments S. 2594, to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended (S. Rept. 1599) (pp. 6103-4).
8. NOMINATION. Received nomination request for Albert A. Carretta as Federal Trade Commissioner (p. 6132).
9. AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS. The Agriculture Subcommittee completed markup of H. R. 7314, agricultural appropriation bill for 1953, and ordered it reported to the full committee with numerous amendments (p. D503).
10. PUERTO RICO. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported without amendments (but did not actually report) S. J. Res. 151, approving the Constitution of Puerto Rico (p. D504).
11. IRRIGATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendments (but did not actually report) H. R. 5633, to approve a contract negotiated with the irrigation districts on the Owyhee Federal project, and to authorize its execution (p. D504).
12. TOBACCO. Received from this Department a proposed bill to increase the minimum farm acreage allotments for burley tobacco (p. 6098).
13. FLOOD CONTROL; RECLAMATION. Received this Department's survey report of the Pecos River Watershed, N. Mex. and Tex. (p. 6098).
14. FARM LANDS; TERRITORIES. Received a resolution adopted by the Hawaii Farm Bureau Federation, favoring H. R. 4799, to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act on the acquisition of farm lots (p. 6099).

BILLS INTRODUCED

15. NEWSPRINT. S. Con. Res. 78, by Sen. Case (for himself and Sen. Johnson, Colo.), to establish a Joint Committee on Newsprint; to Rules Committee (p. 6100). Remarks of author (p. 6100).
16. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. H. R. 8007, H. R. 8008, H. R. 8009, H. R. 8010, H. R. 8011, by Rep. Talle, "to amend the Defense Production Act"; to Banking and Currency Committee (p. 6181).
17. PERSONNEL. H. R. 8013, by Rep. St. George, to increase the efficiency of the Federal Government by improving the training of Federal civilian officers and employees; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 6181).
18. POTATO SHORTAGE. H. Res. 659, by Rep. Lane, to authorize an investigation of the shortage of potatoes in the United States; to Rules Committee (p. 6181).
19. ELECTRIFICATION. H. Res. 655, by Rep. Dondero, to authorize the appointment of a select committee of the House of Representatives to conduct a complete investigation and study of the self-styled Electric Consumers Conference, its officers, representatives, alleged or actual sponsors, members, and so forth, using

I am not going to go into this thing in detail, because sometime soon, when the whistle-stop campaign starts, I am going to give all the facts with regard to this power situation.

Nebraska has not a single private power company in it. They are all municipally owned. They don't talk about it. Seattle owns its own plant and Tacoma owns its own plant. I have talked about Kansas City, Kans., and Independence, Mo., keeping Kansas City, Mo., out of a strait-jacket.

I think you people should do everything you possibly can to get the facts on such things as this, and I think also there may be something going wrong under the Corrupt Practices Act because through the rates that these companies charge you are paying for that (referring to ad of Wisconsin Power & Light Co.)—you are paying for that. The tax collections of the Government are not so great because they charge these off as expenses of operation.

I think I will ask the Attorney General, when he gets in office—and I have had a hard time getting the Attorney General in office—to take a look at this situation and see if the Corrupt Practices Act does not apply.

I didn't intend to make a political speech, but since I have gotten to this point about the Attorney General, I can't help but make the remark that they are always saying there is corruption in the Government. Well, now, there is no such thing. There have been several collectors and one or two other fellows who have gone wrong, but whenever it comes to the attention of the President, he has fired them and ordered a grand jury investigation, and some have been prosecuted and sentenced.

I want to call attention to the fact that one time before we did have corruption in Government, and it was at the top and nothing was done about it until a committee of the Senate dug up the Teapot Dome scandal and they had to go to work on it. Nobody has had to force me to do what is right to keep the Government straight and square and never will.

I did not come down here to talk about that because that is another whistle stop subject I am going to discuss.

I am glad you are here. I am trying to call your attention to the fact that you are on the right track and what I said to Murray Lincoln about the consumers not being represented and their interest not being represented except by such Congressmen and Senators who really have the people's interest at heart—they should all get themselves together and come down here because there are so many more of you than there are of these private power companies and you can make them stand on their heads if you want to.

CONSTRUCTION AND MAINTENANCE OF FACILITIES FOR GENERATING HYDROELECTRIC POWER ON THE CUMBERLAND RIVER IN TENNESSEE

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 654, Rept. No. 1998), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 97) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland

River in Tennessee. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, in the absence of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE], I call up House Resolution 634 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Works, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half the time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 7340, known as the Federal Highway Act, authorizing appropriations in the sum of \$550,000,000 for the year ending June 30, 1954.

This is the Highway Act that we have each year. I do not know of any opposition. I have no requests for time at this moment.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois. Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is no objection on this side to either the rule or the bill.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

(Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of the Whole and include tables.)

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in the Committee of

the Whole and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended, and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7340, the Federal-aid highway bill, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 7340 is an authorization for Federal aid to the highway systems of this country. Those of you who have traveled throughout the country know how our highways are deteriorating. They were designed and built for the traffic load of 20 years ago; repairs, improvements, and new construction have not kept pace with the growth of the automobile industry and the trucking industry.

In 1946 there were some 40,000,000 automobiles on the road; today the number has increased to 52,000,000. The highways have about stood still or gone back; so this authorization is, I think, as important as any authorization that has come to the floor this year.

We are spending many millions and billions of dollars in Europe on roads. I have been trying to get information on just how much money is being spent on roads in Europe, but I find that the information is not available; however, it is in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

This bill provides in matching funds with the States \$550,000,000 a year for the next 2 years, that is, for 1954 and 1955; it provides \$247,500,000 aid to the primary system; \$165,000,000 to the secondary system, and \$137,500,000 to the urban areas. That is money that is to be matched by the States.

We have further authorizations in here which are outright grants: For our forest highways \$22,000,000; for forest roads and trails \$19,250,000; Park Service roads \$10,000,000; parkways \$10,000,000; Indian roads \$10,000,000.

Then we have another authorization in here for the continuing of construction on the Inter-American Highway in the amount of \$16,000,000, defense access roads \$12,000,000, Highway Safety Conference \$200,000, the amount authorized to be taken out of the administra-

tive funds annually, and to finish the construction and completion of the Rama Road, \$8,000,000. The \$12,000,000 for defense access roads is limited to access roads to United States Government-owned timber land and mineral lands, 66⅔ percent to timber and 33⅓ percent for the building of roads into mineral deposits on federally owned property.

The difference between this bill and the 1950 act is that all along the line we have increased the amounts about 10 percent, which is due to the increased index cost of construction. We are trying to put in operation the same amount of roads, no more roads, the same number of miles of highway, as we did in the past 2 years. In order to do that we had to increase the authorization 10 percent.

Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the bill are authorizations, as indicated, federally matched funds.

Section 1 contains a provision that permits the transfer of funds by any State from a secondary system to the primary system and vice versa with a limitation of 25 percent. In the 1950 act the transfer could be made but no percentage was stipulated; so any amount could be transferred when it was approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The committee is going to offer a couple of amendments?

Mr. FALLON. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. I have read the amendments, they are very good ones, and I want to compliment the committee on the action taken by it in resolving to offer those amendments subsequent to the bill being reported.

Mr. FALLON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the existing law permits the District of Columbia, and the States of North Carolina, Virginia, Delaware, and West Virginia to transfer funds from the secondary system to the primary system without limitation.

We held hearings for many months and we heard most of the highway commissioners throughout the country, including many of the mayors of large cities; we heard organizations that are interested in a good highway system for this country. The American Road Builders had their representatives testify. After great deliberation by the committee it agreed unanimously in most part. I understand there will be an amendment offered to cut just one section of the bill. That was the only difference the committee had. Outside of that the bill was reported by the committee unanimously.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does the gentleman know offhand about how much money the Federal Government takes in in gasoline and oil taxes?

Mr. FALLON. Last year it was \$1,699,000,000, and with the increased tax it will be more this year. It is estimated that it may be more like \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. NICHOLSON. What happens to the other part of the money? We appropriate something over \$500,000,000, but what happens to the balance?

Mr. FALLON. It goes into the General Treasury.

Mr. NICHOLSON. To a highway fund?

Mr. FALLON. No.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Does the Federal Government insist on my State not diverting highway taxes?

Mr. FALLON. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. And yet the Federal Government does it itself.

Mr. FALLON. I agree with the gentleman: If you had attended the hearings of our committee you would find that most members of the committee are against diverting highway funds for general use.

SECTION 1. FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Section 1 of the bill authorizes the appropriation of \$550,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955. Said annual sum would be available for expenditure as follows: \$247,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway sys-

tem; \$165,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system; and \$137,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas. This division is on the same percentage basis as provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944, 1948, and 1950.

In arriving at the total authorization of \$550,000,000 for the Federal-aid highway program, the committee took into consideration the authorization of \$500,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1952 and 1953 by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 and increased construction costs experienced since passage of the 1950 act. The total authorized in H. R. 7340 represents a 10-percent increase over the 1950 act authorization for the Federal-aid highway system. It does not now appear likely that this increase will permit the same mileage as that provided for in the 1950 act.

The approximate amounts which each State would receive of the sums authorized by section 1 of the bill have been computed and are shown in the following table:

Approximate apportionment of \$550,000,000 Federal-aid highway authorization, pursuant to H. R. 7250

State	Primary (\$247,500,000)	Secondary (\$165,000,000)	Urban (\$137,500,000)	Total (\$550,000,000)
Alabama.....	\$5,135,000	\$3,984,000	\$1,745,000	\$10,864,000
Arizona.....	3,624,000	2,468,000	518,000	6,610,000
Arkansas.....	4,026,000	3,224,000	745,000	7,995,000
California.....	11,177,000	5,757,000	11,837,000	28,771,000
Colorado.....	4,387,000	2,930,000	1,107,000	8,424,000
Connecticut.....	1,542,000	794,000	2,579,000	4,915,000
Delaware.....	1,191,000	794,000	273,000	2,258,000
Florida.....	3,865,000	2,525,000	2,388,000	8,778,000
Georgia.....	6,040,000	4,610,000	1,941,000	12,591,000
Idaho.....	3,011,000	2,117,000	256,000	5,384,000
Illinois.....	9,370,000	5,103,000	9,313,000	23,786,000
Indiana.....	5,773,000	3,979,000	3,186,000	12,938,000
Iowa.....	5,914,000	4,325,000	1,581,000	11,820,000
Kansas.....	5,945,000	4,160,000	1,252,000	11,357,000
Kentucky.....	4,469,000	3,711,000	1,383,000	9,563,000
Louisiana.....	3,755,000	2,720,000	1,952,000	8,427,000
Maine.....	2,051,000	1,467,000	557,000	4,075,000
Maryland.....	2,129,000	1,300,000	2,260,000	5,689,000
Massachusetts.....	3,062,000	1,129,000	5,543,000	9,734,000
Michigan.....	7,565,000	4,617,000	6,198,000	18,380,000
Minnesota.....	6,405,000	4,517,000	2,168,000	13,090,000
Mississippi.....	4,341,000	3,616,000	737,000	8,694,000
Missouri.....	7,006,000	4,740,000	3,279,000	15,025,000
Montana.....	4,923,000	3,385,000	314,000	8,622,000
Nebraska.....	4,724,000	3,350,000	781,000	8,855,000
Nevada.....	3,150,000	2,105,000	101,000	5,356,000
New Hampshire.....	1,191,000	794,000	386,000	2,371,000
New Jersey.....	3,152,000	1,064,000	5,829,000	10,045,000
New Mexico.....	3,981,000	2,734,000	437,000	7,152,000
New York.....	11,422,000	4,575,000	17,799,000	33,796,000
North Carolina.....	5,995,000	5,126,000	1,711,000	12,832,000
North Dakota.....	3,548,000	2,575,000	225,000	6,348,000
Ohio.....	8,466,000	5,149,000	7,706,000	21,321,000
Oklahoma.....	5,217,000	3,734,000	1,455,000	10,406,000
Oregon.....	4,178,000	2,919,000	1,068,000	8,165,000
Pennsylvania.....	9,548,000	5,682,000	10,081,000	25,311,000
Rhode Island.....	1,191,000	794,000	952,000	2,937,000
South Carolina.....	3,284,000	2,717,000	916,000	6,917,000
South Dakota.....	3,797,000	2,712,000	259,000	6,768,000
Tennessee.....	5,183,000	4,049,000	1,926,000	11,158,000
Texas.....	15,736,000	10,535,000	6,380,000	32,651,000
Utah.....	2,795,000	1,848,000	564,000	5,207,000
Vermont.....	1,191,000	794,000	207,000	2,192,000
Virginia.....	4,625,000	3,593,000	2,977,000	10,295,000
Washington.....	4,033,000	2,694,000	2,009,000	8,736,000
West Virginia.....	2,651,000	2,307,000	867,000	5,825,000
Wisconsin.....	5,780,000	4,031,000	2,608,000	12,419,000
Wyoming.....	3,033,000	2,055,000	145,000	5,233,000
Hawaii.....	1,191,000	794,000	443,000	2,433,000
District of Columbia.....	1,191,000	794,000	1,150,000	3,135,000
Puerto Rico.....	1,260,000	1,317,000	1,145,000	3,722,000

The committee has inserted the word "primary" after the words "Federal-aid" in section 1 (a) to clearly distinguish highways on the Federal-aid primary highway system when compared to those on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

The bill provides that the sums apportioned to each State under the provisions of section 1 shall be available for expenditure for two fiscal years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized and that any money so apportioned that remains unexpended

at the end of such period shall lapse. It further provides that such sums shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects. It, therefore, would follow that any money not expended within the period provided by the law would lapse and be covered into the Treasury. These provisions are identical with those concerning the period of availability of funds authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1948 and 1950.

Section 1 modifies existing law and procedures with respect to transfer of Federal-aid highway funds. It would permit not exceeding 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, to be transferred from the Federal-aid primary system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system from expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system. Such transfer would be effective only when requested and certified by the State highway department as being in the public interest, and approved by the Secretary of Commerce. This new provision is designed in the interest of flexibility. It would make it possible for transfers to be made from the primary system funds for expenditure in the development of projects on the secondary system, whereas heretofore the law—section 3 (b) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944—authorized the transfer, under certain conditions, of secondary funds only. Under existing law only the States of Delaware, North Carolina, and West Virginia, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico may transfer funds from the Federal-aid secondary highway system to the Federal-aid primary highway system, provided such transfer is requested by their respective highway departments and approved by the Secretary of Commerce.

SECTION 2. FOREST HIGHWAYS AND FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

Section 2 would authorize to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 the sum of \$22,000,000 for forest highways and the sum of \$19,250,000 for forest development roads and trails, subject to the same terms and conditions as provided by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950. Said sums are \$2,000,000 more than were authorized for forest highways and \$1,750,000 more than were authorized for forest development roads and trails by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950. Increased construction costs will more than absorb this 10-percent increase in the authorizations of this section.

SECTION 3. ACCESS ROADS

Section 3 of the bill would authorize the additional sum of \$12,000,000 for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended by section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950. It would re-

quire that said sum be used for the construction and improvement of access roads to timber and other sources of raw materials on lands to which title is vested in the United States, subject to the requirement that such roads to be eligible for construction under this section shall be certified to the Secretary of Commerce as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense or such other official as the President may designate, as is required for other access roads under the Defense Highway Act of 1941, as amended. It is the sense of the committee that in the expenditure of the sum authorized by this section approximately two-third thereof should be utilized for the construction of roads to provide access to timber on lands owned by the United States and that the remaining one-third should be used to provide access to strategic minerals needed for defense purposes. This authorization will supplement section 2 of the bill.

SECTION 4. (A) PARK ROADS AND TRAILS

Section 4 (a) provides an authorization of \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1954 and 1955, for roads, trails, and bridges in national parks and monuments and approach roads thereto, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments. The sums authorized are the same in amount as were authorized by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953.

SECTION 4. (B) PARKWAYS

Section 4 (b) would authorize the sum of \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1954 and 1955, for the construction and maintenance of parkways over lands to which title is vested in the United States. It would also increase from \$13,000,000 to \$14,500,000 the limitation imposed by the act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 400), on the cost of constructing the Baltimore-Washington Parkway between Fort Meade, Md., and Washington and would make the additional sum of \$1,500,000, which it would authorize, available for contract immediately upon the passage of the bill. Aside from the increase in the limitation on the cost of Baltimore-Washington Parkway, the authorization contained in this section is \$3,000,000 less than was authorized for parkways under the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953.

The following communication from Mr. Thomas H. MacDonald, Commissioner of Public Roads, to the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman, Subcommittee on Roads, sets forth the justification for the increased authorization for the construction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway between Fort Meade and Washington:

SECTION 4. (C) INDIAN ROADS

Section 4 (c) would authorize the sum of \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1954 and 1955, for the construction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and bridges within Indian reservations and to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands in accordance with provisions of the act of May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750). This

sum is \$4,000,000 more than was authorized for the same purpose by the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for the fiscal years 1952 and 1953. The increased amount is deemed necessary to implement the withdrawal program of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, so that roads now badly deteriorated, can be put in condition to be taken over by the counties, thus relieving the Government of all future responsibility.

SECTION 5. RAMA ROAD

Section 5 would authorize the sum of \$4,000,000 to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1953 and 1954, for the completion of the construction of the road from San Benito to Rama in the Republic of Nicaragua, pursuant to an agreement between said Republic and the United States. The expenditure of said sum would be subject to certain safeguarding conditions and limitations which are prescribed in the section.

SECTION 6. INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Section 6 would authorize to be appropriated the additional sum of \$8,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1953 and 1954, to enable the United States to continue its cooperation with the American Republics in Central America in the survey and construction of the Inter-American Highway within said republics. The appropriations so authorized would be required to be expended subject to the matching requirements and conditions contained in existing legislation except that not to exceed one-third of the appropriation for each fiscal year may be expended without the requirement of matching on the part of any republic if the Secretary of State should find that the cost of constructing the highway in such republic will be beyond its reasonable capacity to bear. The annual sum of \$8,000,000 proposed by the bill is twice the amount authorized for the same purpose by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1951 and 1952, and such sum is considered necessary to accelerate the work in order that the project may be completed within a reasonable number of years.

SECTION 7. HIGHWAY SAFETY

Section 7 is a new provision which would require the Secretary of Commerce to prepare, and reexamine and revise annually, an action program to increase and promote safety on the highways, roads, and streets throughout the United States. The coordination of highway-safety activities of all Federal departments and agencies would be included in such program. The bill would provide that in carrying out such program the Secretary of Commerce shall cooperate to the fullest extent possible with State, local, and private bodies devoted to the promotion of highway safety, and that he shall make an annual report to the Congress setting forth the actions taken pursuant to this section. For such purposes, the section would authorize not to exceed \$200,000 to be expended annually out of available administrative funds of the Bureau of Public Roads. Section 14 of the Federal-

Aid Highway Act of 1950 authorized the Bureau of Public Roads to expend not to exceed \$75,000 annually for highway safety. The committee is of the view that the program proposed by section 7 is most desirable by reason of the increasingly heavy toll in lives and property damage each year from motor-vehicle accidents as reflected by the following table:

Motor-vehicle accidents, 1945-50¹

Calendar year—	Number of accidents	Number of nonfatal injuries	Number of deaths	Property damage
1945-----	5,500,000	1,000,000	28,076	\$650,000,000
1946-----	6,150,000	1,200,000	33,411	800,000,000
1947-----	8,400,000	1,150,000	32,697	1,100,000,000
1948-----	8,200,000	1,100,000	32,259	1,100,000,000
1949-----	7,600,000	1,100,000	31,500	1,100,000,000
1950-----	8,300,000	1,200,000	35,000	1,250,000,000
1951-----	-----	-----	237,500	-----

¹ Source: National Safety Council's "Accident Facts."

² Preliminary estimate by National Safety Council.

Section 8 is a saving provision to the effect that if any section, subsection, or other provision of the bill, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the validity of the remainder thereof.

Section 9 provides for the repeal of all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the bill and that the bill shall take effect upon its passage.

Section 10 provides that the bill may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] has covered the ground very well. I am always tempted, when I take the floor in behalf of a road bill, to quote again the statement of Lord Bacon made 300 years ago in regard to good roads. This quotation was placed over the doorway of the Transportation Building in Chicago during the World's Fair in 1893. The quotation is this:

There be three things that make a nation great and strong: Fertile soil, busy workshops, and easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place.

It is with the last sentence that we are concerned today, and that is easy conveyance of men and goods from place to place on good roads.

The gentleman from Maryland has covered the subject so well that there is very little more for me to say except this: If there is any one thing that the American people are conscious about it is good roads. When they drive up to a gas station and say to the attendant "Fill her up" they are conscious of the fact that a part of the bill that they pay is going back to build the roads on which they travel.

We all know that there is a 2-cent-per-gallon tax on gasoline, which is a Federal tax, and there is also a 9-cent-a-gallon tax on oil. As the gentleman has already stated, this year it is estimated that the Federal Government will

take from our people something like \$2,000,000,000 in such taxes. That money is not earmarked at all. All we are asking is \$550,000,000 for the year, for 1954, and \$550,000,000 for 1955. This is about 25 percent of what they pay in. The rest of the money goes into the Federal Treasury.

To give you some idea of what has happened in this country in the last 10 years, the number of cars on our highways is about 18,000,000 more than 10 years ago. The number of miles that people travel in the United States has increased from 300,000,000,000 traveled miles to 600,000,000,000 traveled miles, and the number of registered cars in the United States has increased to 52,217,000, or 1 car for every 3 people in our country. No nation on the face of the earth even comes near to equaling that. In England, which I think is the closest, it is about 1 car for every 470 people. That gives some indication of how widespread the wealth of this country is among the people of the United States.

This bill follows the same pattern as the bill of 2 years ago and the bill of 4 years ago. All that the committee did was to take the figures for the matching funds of 2 years ago, 1950, and add 10 percent to it in order to take up the depreciation of the dollar or the increase in cost. We are not getting as many miles today, by the way, for the money we are spending as we did 6 years ago.

Mr. Mcgregor. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Mcgregor. I am sure the gentleman wants to keep the record straight. We have added 10 percent over what it was plus an additional amount for certain types of roads such as forest highways and forest trails.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; but I am speaking of the matching funds that go to the 48 States.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I am wondering if the gentleman's committee has given any serious consideration to the abuse of our Federal highway system by trucks, the systematic violation of the law by trucks, and to the increasing expense of construction caused by the increasing weight of the loads carried over our highways.

Mr. DONDERO. No; because that is not a subject of jurisdiction of our committee. Of course, it was discussed. I might say to the gentleman from Maine, however, that in regard to that subject it was pointed out that the general passenger traffic of the country has increased some 45 percent since the end of the war. Truck traffic, to which the gentleman alludes, has increased something more than that. In my own State of Michigan, our highway commissioner testified, it had increased 85 percent, indicating the vast increase in traffic of both passenger vehicles and trucks.

I might add a little information as to two bridges over the Potomac River. I am told by those who seem to know that

those two bridges are the two busiest bridges on earth. While they were estimated to carry some 50,000 vehicles a day, it now reaches 80,000 vehicles a day, simply indicating the vast increase in traffic among the people of the United States.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. The formula under which these funds are apportioned to the States has been quite a mystery to me each year as we have considered this legislation. I am sure there must be some basic explanation. I have had some query in my own mind about it. I wonder if the gentleman could take a moment or two and express in phraseology that would be comprehensible to a high-school sophomore, and give us just a general idea of how these apparently largely varying sums go to States that do have a considerable mileage of highway, sometimes out of proportion to the size of the States.

Mr. DONDERO. That was provided in a formula included in legislation some years ago and it has never been changed. It has been found to work so well and people are so satisfied with it that no change has been sought. I think that is the question the gentleman is asking.

Mr. COTTON. I understood there must be a formula, but, if it is not too elementary, what is the fundamental principle under that formula?

Mr. DONDERO. Area, population, and miles of road, I think, are the three fundamental or basic principles upon which the allocations are made.

Mr. COTTON. Does matching of funds enter into that formula, or is that formula just on the elements the gentleman has mentioned?

Mr. DONDERO. Just on the elements I have mentioned. Of course, each State is given its proportionate share according to that formula. It has worked out in a very satisfactory way.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know why my State pays in about \$25,000,000 of this highway business, and we get only \$9,000,000 back. I would like to know where the other \$16,000,000 goes.

Mr. DONDERO. As has already been stated, we are only taking about 25 percent of the amount collected from people for gas and oil tax. The rest goes into the Federal Treasury. If I had my way about it, and in view of the testimony presented to us in committee to the effect that we are wearing out our roads faster than we are building them, I would allocate a larger sum for the building of roads because they are one of the essential things in this country, and I would say one of the most necessary for defense that we have.

Mr. NICHOLSON. How much does it cost us for this Bureau to administer this money that we pay in? Is it just a matter of bookkeeping with no overhead?

Mr. DONDERO. There is a very slight overhead, I will say to the gentleman. I think we can say with credit to the Bureau that administers these funds, that they do an excellent piece of work at very little cost.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I believe the answer to that question is approximately 3 3/4 percent is for the administrative costs.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, furthering what I said a moment ago that the American people are conscious of good roads, today travel on toll roads has gone beyond all dreams of the people who built those roads. People are willing to pay an extra cent a mile in order to ride on a good road. I say that shows how anxious and eager our people are that we have good roads.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was interested in the statement of the gentleman from Maryland who spoke a few moments ago with respect to the building of roads in other countries. I believe he said, and I think I am correct in my recollection, hundreds of millions of dollars are being expended from our Federal Treasury to build roads in other countries, especially in Europe. Can the gentleman give us any figures on that?

Mr. DONDERO. I cannot give you the amount, but I do know they are building some roads in Europe with American money, but how much I cannot tell you.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am informed, not reliably however, that we are spending about half as much as we are spending on our own roads in America.

Mr. DONDERO. I do know what we are spending on some other subjects, I can say to the gentleman.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. The one-half cent gasoline tax which was recently assessed is for Federal funds, and was not for the purpose of building roads. It was for increasing the general fund; is that not correct?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct. The one-half cent has yielded something like \$300,000,000 annually.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Does the gentleman think that amount could be increased—to give 25 percent back to the States?

Mr. DONDERO. You mean 25 percent more?

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Additional.

Mr. DONDERO. The road builders and some road officials tell us that this money is not enough, and that they could use almost double this amount every year to keep our roads up to standard. Someone said it would take something like \$20,000,000,000 in money to bring our roads up to the condition that they ought to be at the present time. But, of course, that amount of money is not in this bill. We are trying to follow a moderate road

program in the construction of our highways.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Would the gentleman think that if all of this 2 cents a gallon were turned back to the States, it would be in the right proportion, and that we would overhaul this formula which has been used for so long?

Mr. DONDERO. It would contribute much toward making our road system in this country as fine as any road system anywhere in the world. In fact, they are now. It would make them much better than they are today, and we could maintain them where they are wearing out so fast because of the increased traffic load.

The interstate system of highways was authorized by the Congress in the Federal Aid Act of 1944 and ordered to be a selected system of the most important routes and not to exceed a total mileage of 40,000. This mileage is not new mileage, but is a selected mileage from the present Federal aid primary system in rural and urban areas.

In accordance with the Act of Congress, the State highway department selected a major part of the mileage, with the approval of the Bureau of Public Roads, and designated the interstate system of highways which represents approximately 1 percent of the rural mileage and carries approximately 20 percent of all the rural traffic. It is essentially the most heavily traveled mileage in America.

In 1949 the State highway departments, cooperating with the Bureau of Public Roads, estimated the deficiencies in the existing interstate system in the light of the presently approved standards for highway construction, as prepared and adopted by the American Association of State Highway Officials. At that time, the estimated cost, prepared in a detailed study by the State highway departments, to relieve these deficiencies on the interstate system approximated \$11,200,000,000. In the light of increased highway construction costs since that time, the figure would probably be in the neighborhood of 15 percent greater in 1952.

The chief administrative officers of the American Association of State Highway Officials, meeting in Chicago in November of 1951, considered and adopted a national policy on Federal aid for highways preparatory to consideration of the Federal Aid Act of 1952. They recommended, at that time, that a separate section be incorporated in the new act for the interstate system authorizing an amount of \$210,000,000 annually for that system.

The membership considered a formula for the apportionment of such funds, it being the general opinion that the old section 21 formula under which primary funds have been apportioned for many years was not an equitable formula for the apportionment of interstate funds. When the Federal-Aid Act of 1944 was under consideration by the Congress, the same question arose with regard to the apportionment of urban funds, and, at the time, upon the rec-

ommendation of the American Association of State Highway Officials, the Congress approved a formula of population for the apportionment of urban funds which was a wise and equitable decision. The same philosophies obtained in regard to the apportionment of funds for the interstate system.

The association considered three formulas in Chicago at the meeting previously mentioned: One being the old section 21 formula now in effect on primary funds; two, a formula based on estimated costs of improvement of the system; and three, a formula based on population with a floor set to the end that no State would receive less than three-fourths of 1 percent of the funds to be made available.

The third formula, after much deliberation, was approved and, upon a roll-call vote with 43 member departments represented and voting out of a total of 52, 42 member departments voted for approval of the policy position, with 1 member department—the Bureau of Public Roads—being recorded as not voting. Subsequently the remaining member departments were canvassed by mail, being in total number 9, 7 voting in affirmative support of the policy position, 1 voting in the negative, and 1 not voting; making a total of 49 member departments out of a total of 52 giving their support of the policy position on this matter.

H. R. 7340, proposed new Federal-aid bill as drafted by the House, makes no provision for an interstate system. S. 2437, the Senate version of the bill, includes the interstate system section in the amount of \$50,000,000, but sets up a formula for apportionment of these funds identical with old section 21 of the regular Federal-Aid Act, being: one-third area, one-third population, and one-third post road mileage.

As to the general situation, the following information is pertinent: In 1941, at the beginning of World War II, there were approximately 34,000,000 motor vehicles registered in America, of which 4,900,000 were trucks. In 1952, there are approximately 52,000,000 motor vehicles registered in America, of which 9,000,000 are trucks. In 1941, the total vehicle mileage for the year was 333,000,000,000. In 1952, the estimated mileage is 500,000,000,000.

In 1942, in the truck category, State-wide planned surveys showed that 41 truck axles out of each 1,000 exceeded 18,000 pounds per axle. In 1950, 91 truck axles out of each 1,000 exceeded 18,000 pounds per axle. By a gross load comparison, in 1942, 111 units out of each 1,000 exceeded 30,000 pounds gross load. In 1950, 187 units out of each 1,000 exceeded 30,000 pounds gross load. The figures for 1952 would be substantially higher, but they are not available at this time.

In 1941, the Federal Government collected in highway user taxes—gasoline, oil, tires, parts, vehicles, and so forth—\$573,000,000. In 1952, it is estimated that the Federal collections from this source will slightly exceed \$2,000,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this bill to authorize continuing of the Federal highway program for another 2 years is, at best, merely stop-gap legislation. It does not, under any circumstances, provide adequately for the vast needs in road construction now going unmet throughout our country.

Someone has pointed out that if all the new highways constructed since 1946 were stretched end to end they would not provide enough room to even park all of the new passenger cars which have been produced in the same period. At the same time that even this limited road construction has been achieved approximately 2 miles of road has become obsolete for each mile constructed.

Highway construction is, of course, a basic responsibility of the States, and should remain so. The Federal Government, however, under the mandate provided in the Constitution to provide roads, has been the instrument of coordinating and developing what progress we have made in the field of an adequate national transportation system. Through the incentive system provided by Federal aid, minimum standards have been established which give the taxpayer and the road user far better highways for his money. We have vast needs in the way of new express freeways for our interstate road system and for the construction of many other modern improvements in the highway system. At the same time, the needs of the farmers of America are far from being properly met, especially in relation to the number of vehicles which now use these roads.

The Public Works Committee, in considering this legislation, recognized the impossibility of authorizing any major expansion in the present road program, only because of the pressing fiscal difficulties which our Government is likely to continue to meet for the next 2 years. I think it is only fair, however, to warn the Nation that this problem cannot be neglected any longer without grave dangers to our over-all economy. The next road program authorization which comes before the Congress should meet this problem head-on. We cannot avoid the responsibility any longer.

The United States has two and a half times as many motor vehicles as all the other countries of the world combined. No other nation on earth relies so heavily on automotive transportation for the mass movement of people and products. More than 40,000 communities are completely dependent on cars, trucks, and busses for all of their transportation needs. Three-fourths of all passenger travel between cities, towns, and farms goes by car or bus. Two-thirds of all freight is shipped by truck during some part of its journey. Therefore, it is vital that the automotive vehicles, on which we so largely depend, be kept moving quickly, economically, and safely.

With automobile registrations increasing every year, this situation will get worse as time goes on, unless steps are taken immediately by towns, cities, counties, States, and the Federal Government, individually and collectively, to modernize our obsolete street and highway systems. Americans are beginning to realize that installing more stop signs, rerouting trucks, reducing car speeds, and other restrictive measures taken in the interest of safety provide no permanent solution to the problem. Last year, the economic loss from traffic accidents totaled \$3,500,000,000. This is more than was spent on the entire system of highways, roads, and streets.

Most of our present highways were designed and built during those years, when car speeds were low, when truck loads were light, and when the volume of motor travel was small. Twenty-five years ago, there were only 20,000,000 motor vehicles. Today, there are nearly 52,000,000. Yet, during the past quarter of a century little has been done to expand our highway system to keep pace with the growth in traffic volume.

According to competent authorities, it will take \$5,000,000,000 to \$7,000,000,000 a year for the next 15 years to build essential roads, to modernize existing highways, and to maintain our present system in a satisfactory condition. This gives us some comprehension of the magnitude of the task that lies ahead.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, first let me pay my respects to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] as well as the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY]; they certainly have cooperated in every way in all phases of this problem, and have been especially considerate of the minority side.

Sometimes when we talk about economy, and we find that many people are for economy only in certain phases of life; some believe in "econo-me" with the "me" left out.

The bill before us today, H. R. 7340, is known as the highway bill and authorizes the expenditures for the years of 1954 and 1955.

This bill is the result of several weeks of study by the Committee on Public Works and the consideration of a number of bills which represent an expenditure from \$400,000,000 per year to \$700,000,000 per year. The highway program is one of the largest programs of our economy. There are three Federal-aid systems—primary, secondary, and urban. They constitute the background of the Nation's transportation plant involving a total of approximately 664,000 miles of highways. Of this total 219,000 miles are on the rural primary, 420,000 miles on the secondary, and 16,000 miles on the urban system. Many of us have different views on the specific need of these systems.

Some years ago the Public Roads Committee of the Congress, upon which I served at that time, decided our Federal

funds should be allocated on a percentage basis. The following formula was established—45 percent for Federal-aid primary system, 30 percent for Federal-aid secondary system, and 25 percent for Federal-aid urban system.

This formula was arrived at because we felt all types of roads, either farm-to-market or urban roads, were a part of a system traveled by the general public. The Federal Highway Act of 1944 was the first specific adequate recommendation of our rural road needs written into our basic highway law. We who drafted the legislation felt adequate transportation for the farmer was essential to the continued prosperity of the American people. The crops upon which our economic well-being and continued existence of not only farmers but all the people depend must be transported in large part from the farm to the market and the consumer via our roads. Both, therefore, suffer from an inadequate road system so a good road program is of vital concern to the Nation as well as the State and the people.

There is some question among certain Members of Congress concerning the farm-to-market road system, but your attention is called to the fact that of 3,300,000 miles of roads, alleys and streets in our Nation, 3,000,000 are in rural districts; 23 percent of which are graded and drained but not surfaced, and 31 percent are undrained and not surfaced. Thus, more than half of the roads serving the farmers are not all-weather roads.

Over the secondary and feeder roads 4,000,000 children ride to school daily and one-fourth of our entire population receives its mail over them. These roads carry approximately one-third of all the mileage of the automotive vehicles in the United States.

I hope this explanation of the farm-to-market road program will prove to some of my distinguished colleagues that the rural system of roads plays a very important part in our economy.

H. R. 6094, the bill introduced January 15, 1952, commonly known as the administration bill, set up \$400,000,000 for Federal aid for highways. When the authors of H. R. 6094 made a division between Federal and primary, secondary and urban, they completely ignored the percentage formula established several years ago which is working as well as any could be expected to work.

When the Committee on Public Works drafted H. R. 7340, now before us, it returned to the original formula and increased the amount of the administration bill from \$400,000,000 to \$550,000,000. This means that the amount allocated under the 1950 act—\$500,000,000—was increased 10 percent.

I am certain my record will justify the statement that I believe good roads are a part of our national-defense program. I also recognize, however, that the financial status of our country is a part of our defense program. An object is only as strong as its weakest link. I, therefore, am wondering whether we can afford to authorize an expenditure of \$550,000,000 for our road program which

will be spent during the years of 1954 and 1955.

May I emphasize that the authorization we are passing here today will not be a part of any appropriation bill for actual construction until the years 1954-55. We sometimes wonder why we continue to authorize expenditures when the Appropriations Committee will not appropriate the amounts authorized. Just a few days ago we passed an appropriation bill of \$400,000,000 for highways, yet the 1950 Highway Authorization Act covered by that appropriation called for a grant of \$594,650,000 which includes the \$500,000,000 for the various types of highways plus various items including forest highways, forest roads and trails, Park Service roads, parkways, Indian roads and public-lands roads, including \$8,000,000 for the Inter-American Highway and \$10,000,00 for defense-access roads.

I would like to call attention to the fact that on March 31, 1952, the unprogramed balance of Federal highway funds was \$393,098,749. I firmly believe there would be far in excess to \$100,000,000 as an expended unencumbered balance even if all our obligations were adhered to the various States.

Attention is called to the fact the bill before us for consideration calls for an expenditure of \$56,000,000 for the Inter-American Highway and \$8,000,000 for the Rama Road. I believe the Rama Road item is one for which we have a definite international commitment and I feel the amount contained in the bill should remain so that our international agreement will be met, but the item of \$56,000,000 for the Inter-American Highway defined in this bill sets up \$16,000,000 which is twice the amount we authorized for this project in the 1950 act. Certainly, we should not double the amount of money going for highway purposes in foreign countries when we recognize our program here is badly in need of funds and when we are faced with a debt of \$268,000,000,000.

Let me call your attention to the fact that revenues derived from road taxes amount to approximately \$1,800,000,000 per year. I charge, therefore, that when the President sent up his highway bill drafted by the Budget Bureau he was at-

tempting to set a trap for some of us who believe in an adequate road program so he could say that some people believe in economy until it affects them.

I would challenge anyone and let them check my record in this House—I am for as much economy as anyone else, but I certainly believe that it is time for us to give to the people of the United States and our close neighbors some money so that we can protect ourselves which certainly includes an adequate road program instead of sending so much of it to European countries.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I shall be pleased to yield to the very distinguished gentleman from Iowa, a former member of the Roads Committee.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman and appreciate the information he has given us very much. I was extremely interested in the gentleman's statement about the \$1,800,000,000. I understand that is correct. Under this bill, then, the road system in the United States—that is, the strategic network of roads, farm-to-market roads and urban areas—will get a total per year of less than one-third of the amount of money that has come into the Federal Treasury from the gasoline tax, the highway user, the used car tax, the tax on tires, tubes, and lubricating oil, and so forth.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Can the gentleman tell me where the balance of that money is being used?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I wish it were within my knowledge or ability to answer the gentleman's question. I think every American citizen who pays that tax should have that question answered. But we have tried, and I am sure the gentleman from Iowa has tried, to find out where all the road money is going. In my opinion it is going into the general fund of the Treasury of the United States, and then given to some foreign countries under the foreign aid program, to build whatever they might decide or whatever is suggested by some department of the United States.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Does the gentleman think it is fair for the Govern-

ment to collect from the highway users three times as much money as it puts back into the highways?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Indeed I do not.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This bill, as I understand it, is really a continuation of the act we passed in 1946 and amended and passed in 1948, except that the amount is slightly increased over the last act?

Mr. MCGREGOR. That is correct. The formula of distribution remains the same.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. And the formula remains the same. It is the same for the farm-to-market road system as it has been in the past?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Yes; some increases have been given to the forest highways and trails and other items—including Inter-American Highways.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In other words, there is no reduction in formula or allocation of amounts in any portion of the bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is the same for our own road program, with the exception of an increase of 10 percent over the 1950 act which we thought would take care of partial increases in construction costs.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman, and I wish to congratulate him and all the members of the committee for the good work they have done.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I wish it were possible to increase the allocation of this road program. It is not false economy when you spend money on roads. I know of no phase of our economy that plays such an important part as the road program. I want to pay my respects to Commissioner MacDonald of the Bureau of Public Roads and his staff. They have done a grand job under the conditions existing today. You will probably hear in debate of the unencumbered and unexpended balances in the Bureau of Public Roads. I am submitting for the Record a chart showing the unencumbered and unexpended balances for each State. There is in the Bureau of Public Roads an unencumbered unprogramed balance as of April 30, 1952, of \$336,321,000.

Status of Federal-aid highway program as of Apr. 30, 1952

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Unprogramed balances	Active program											
		Programed only			Plans approved, construction not started			Construction under way			Total		
		Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles
Alabama	9,843	30,684	15,394	477.3	8,210	4,571	123.9	22,335	11,261	439.1	61,229	31,226	1,040.3
Arizona	804	5,747	4,146	133.0	2,210	1,583	36.8	8,881	6,171	140.7	16,838	11,900	310.5
Arkansas	7,722	6,824	3,760	246.5	4,025	2,011	153.7	16,168	8,233	450.0	27,017	14,004	850.2
California	4,258	38,400	13,759	179.9	18,985	8,366	78.8	78,258	37,784	236.7	135,643	59,909	495.4
Colorado	6,225	4,808	2,271	114.4	3,507	1,946	83.3	11,601	6,299	255.5	19,916	10,516	453.2
Connecticut	6,477	3,500	1,800	13.2	1,709	822	2.0	10,516	5,571	19.2	15,725	8,193	34.4
Delaware	2,610	1,600	800	8.0	2,767	1,032	12.1	3,281	1,630	37.7	7,648	3,462	57.8
Florida	4,964	15,034	7,782	319.8	10,922	5,527	183.9	13,974	6,766	290.6	39,930	20,075	794.3
Georgia	8,156	17,286	8,784	501.0	9,324	4,356	134.0	83,816	16,612	509.1	60,426	29,752	1,144.1
Idaho	5,630	11,600	7,305	283.0	1,221	766	39.5	6,395	3,497	127.3	18,216	11,568	449.8
Illinois	14,120	61,635	28,437	427.0	24,986	12,501	263.7	73,735	37,257	591.4	150,356	78,195	1,282.1
Indiana	12,106	36,119	18,773	206.0	11,441	6,142	226.5	24,316	12,637	252.4	71,876	37,552	684.9
Iowa	2,433	17,712	9,355	583.9	11,111	5,580	507.2	16,870	8,398	687.3	45,693	23,333	1,778.4
Kansas	8,856	11,270	5,482	1,288.4	8,187	4,078	371.8	16,744	8,750	629.2	36,201	18,310	2,289.4
Kentucky	5,213	19,497	10,200	283.4	7,388	3,990	133.6	13,587	6,868	248.8	40,472	21,058	665.8
Louisiana	3,142	18,047	8,676	127.6	13,256	6,136	79.5	17,115	8,553	172.8	48,418	23,365	379.9

Status of Federal-aid highway program as of Apr. 30, 1952—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Unpro-grammed balances	Active program											
		Programed only			Plans approved, construction not started			Construction under way			Total		
		Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles	Total cost	Federal funds	Miles
Maine.....	3,039	7,973	4,360	45.7	2,019	1,011	10.1	7,168	3,620	63.0	17,160	8,991	118.8
Maryland.....	8,230	4,079	1,953	56.1	544	275	11.1	11,163	5,833	24.9	15,786	8,061	92.1
Massachusetts.....	7,362	7,693	3,849	11.1	2,073	836	-----	50,159	24,360	46.6	59,925	29,045	57.7
Michigan.....	5,915	32,076	15,972	524.2	9,854	4,975	181.8	56,246	24,731	324.1	98,176	45,678	1,030.1
Minnesota.....	5,468	11,569	6,086	1,167.3	14,711	7,458	811.2	20,056	11,089	664.7	46,336	24,633	2,643.2
Mississippi.....	4,702	17,744	9,124	626.0	7,010	3,476	215.1	17,866	9,310	466.5	42,620	21,910	1,307.6
Missouri.....	11,596	30,615	15,451	890.7	12,226	6,113	301.6	43,362	22,760	648.1	86,203	44,324	1,840.4
Montana.....	9,919	10,234	6,163	332.0	3,954	2,273	104.3	18,844	11,310	300.0	33,032	19,746	736.3
Nebraska.....	12,183	12,017	6,294	527.1	8,337	4,160	182.8	17,144	8,510	557.6	37,498	18,964	1,267.5
Nevada.....	2,494	7,727	6,157	314.3	1,278	1,069	46.9	4,498	3,739	162.5	13,503	10,965	523.7
New Hampshire.....	2,612	3,661	1,974	24.1	629	314	2.2	6,461	3,219	45.0	10,751	5,507	71.3
New Jersey.....	2,909	13,212	6,486	34.5	5,354	2,665	9.3	31,948	15,634	21.8	50,514	24,785	65.6
New Mexico.....	2,130	6,776	4,339	262.9	2,469	1,584	60.7	13,399	8,570	303.8	22,644	14,493	627.4
New York.....	44,554	78,229	40,881	145.2	13,512	6,262	63.3	103,551	47,271	368.2	195,292	94,414	576.7
North Carolina.....	6,902	22,815	11,110	418.7	6,007	2,631	169.5	22,658	11,363	405.0	51,480	25,104	993.2
North Dakota.....	2,394	13,249	6,785	1,429.5	5,554	2,789	510.8	8,713	4,397	762.5	27,516	13,971	2,702.8
Ohio.....	14,906	36,531	17,944	157.0	13,139	6,485	73.6	74,269	37,777	251.6	123,939	62,206	482.2
Oklahoma.....	4,448	16,029	8,872	257.3	8,088	4,217	167.5	19,813	10,552	201.6	43,930	23,641	626.4
Oregon.....	1,836	3,789	2,240	61.4	3,629	2,141	73.3	16,849	9,567	225.2	24,267	13,948	359.9
Pennsylvania.....	5,098	54,807	27,396	161.7	10,127	5,051	15.6	73,765	36,625	192.8	138,699	69,072	370.1
Rhode Island.....	1,283	5,850	2,925	45.6	581	290	1.2	18,340	9,104	23.3	24,771	12,319	70.1
South Carolina.....	3,884	11,487	6,204	381.3	3,610	1,775	156.6	14,865	7,600	342.4	29,962	15,579	880.3
South Dakota.....	1,737	9,330	5,353	743.8	5,081	3,028	317.3	12,440	7,227	681.1	26,851	15,608	1,742.2
Tennessee.....	6,294	12,677	6,023	436.9	13,189	6,273	227.8	27,089	12,938	356.3	52,955	25,234	1,021.0
Texas.....	17,782	11,412	6,230	227.4	12,370	6,349	469.5	57,175	29,538	954.8	80,957	42,117	1,651.7
Utah.....	2,780	3,648	2,801	70.6	3,418	2,672	65.3	6,386	4,699	93.4	13,452	10,172	229.3
Vermont.....	1,483	4,600	2,484	48.8	1,699	884	21.2	5,497	2,734	35.9	11,796	6,102	105.9
Virginia.....	7,946	19,985	9,972	377.7	6,227	3,102	139.5	24,285	12,140	387.6	50,497	25,214	904.8
Washington.....	2,672	15,423	7,500	265.0	2,770	1,439	58.1	22,470	11,404	133.5	40,663	20,343	456.6
West Virginia.....	6,914	9,125	4,633	82.5	2,798	1,404	42.4	12,308	6,132	110.7	24,231	12,169	235.6
Wisconsin.....	5,145	28,370	14,883	593.5	17,255	8,290	215.1	18,927	9,693	407.8	64,552	32,866	1,216.4
Wyoming.....	1,979	2,072	1,360	22.4	1,856	1,311	46.7	8,051	5,208	162.0	11,979	7,879	231.1
Hawaii.....	1,782	7,270	3,482	13.0	439	220	5.2	10,648	4,267	24.0	18,357	7,969	42.2
District of Columbia.....	7,801	84	42	2	-----	-----	-----	3,252	1,819	9	3,336	1,861	1.1
Puerto Rico.....	5,583	8,126	3,848	50.5	3,988	1,940	9.2	8,829	4,021	31.5	20,943	9,809	91.2
Total.....	336,321	830,047	427,900	15,998.4	345,044	174,169	7,216.1	1,235,086	625,048	14,868.5	2,410,177	1,227,117	38,083.0

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. At the rate the projects are being programed, that total amount will be exhausted at the end of the fiscal period, will it not?

Mr. MCGREGOR. The fiscal period ends in 1 month. This will add more to this fund.

The other day we again appropriated \$400,000,000. There will always be a large balance but I am not objecting to that balance. There must be a balance but I do say there is definitely something wrong with the program, and I will assume my proportionate share of the responsibility, when we have \$336,000,000 of an unencumbered, unexpended balance, whether it is at the State level or at the national level. I do not think it is necessary to have that big a balance and I, for one, shall do everything I can to initiate a program, either at State level, at my little township level, or at the Federal level, to get a road program that is at least adequate for our needs. We should use the money authorized by the Congress. Let us get the roads in better shape and we cannot do it by having the money here in Washington.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is characteristic of the lag that usually prevails with respect to the programing of projects?

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is my understanding this is not quite as high as it has been in the past, but it is higher

than normal. On March 31 the unexpended balance was \$393,098,000. I hope that my friend will agree with me that something should be done to initiate a road program so that we can get the money spent and a program put into effect and not carry such a tremendous balance.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. It is going to be rather difficult for us to propose legislation that will cure the fiscal affairs of each respective State in obtaining sufficient funds to keep their matching at a permanent level. It seems to me that it has not been as real a problem as the gentleman says it is at the present time.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think it is definitely a real problem, for this reason: So many of our States, during the war, allowed their roads to get into such a condition that it now requires practically all of their money to maintain them. When their maintenance bills are paid they have no funds left for which to match Federal funds for road construction. I think that is a problem that we are going to have to recognize—and it is unusual for me to say, because I have always objected and have been very careful that no Federal funds are to be used for maintenance—but I think we are going to have to give some additional aid to the States possibly for maintenance for a definite short period of time so that they will have a sufficient amount of money to match Federal funds. I have a list of the States here showing which have unmatched funds. Take, for in-

stance, Ohio, \$14,906,000 worth of Federal funds, and I find that my State does not have any money to match those Federal funds, and I think similar conditions exist in practically every State.

We are going to hear this plea of economy again, and some of my good friends will say, "Here is a Republican that wants to increase the President's budget." I am very happy to accept that challenge, because the budget request certainly was not in accord, anywhere near in accord, with the needs of the various States, and I am certain that my good friend from Massachusetts will agree with that.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I referred to.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Which friend from Massachusetts did the gentleman have in mind?

Mr. MCGREGOR. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Having drawn the inference, I want the RECORD to show it. My friend says that he will accept the challenge. What challenge is being hurled at him?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Because of the fact that the question is often raised, I think, that the majority floor leader has often said, "Here are fellows hollering for economy, and when it comes time to vote they do not vote for economy."

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true; is it not?

Mr. McGREGOR. It is false economy, the highway bill as recommended by the President—only \$400,000,000 for the roads of our country—when the people pay nearly \$1,750,000,000 yearly for what they think is for road purposes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true; is it not?

Mr. McGREGOR. What is true?

Mr. McCORMACK. The statement is correct.

Mr. McGREGOR. I will never vote against reasonable economy, I am for economy, but there are lots of times when it is false economy, and the legislation, as submitted by the President, when he says only \$400,000,000 out of \$1,800,000,000 will be spent on roads, is false economy.

Mr. McCORMACK. This being a nice philosophical discussion, I just want to know who is challenging my friend. I am not challenging him; I am following his leadership.

Mr. McGREGOR. Not being as long in political life as my distinguished friend from Massachusetts, but knowing his tactics, I feel certain that some of these days, he is going to get on the floor and say, "Here is McGREGOR talking for economy, but he increased the President's budget."

Mr. McCORMACK. When has my friend ever heard me take the floor, in relation to any one of my colleagues, specifically mentioning him by name? That is a policy that I do not follow, and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. McGREGOR. I used my own name, so I would not draw anyone else into this very friendly discussion and possibly a prophecy.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no challenge to my friend that I know of. I think the gentleman should change his remarks and say "I am giving leadership that could recognize no challenge."

Mr. McGREGOR. Well, those are very kind words, but still the President's budget calls for \$400,000,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. So there will be no misunderstanding by anybody who might read the RECORD—and this is a pleasant colloquy—I want the RECORD to show that I am in agreement with my friend.

Mr. McGREGOR. Well, that is very kind. I appreciate that compliment very much, and I do thank the majority floor leader for his support and also his friendship.

(Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK], a member of the committee.

(Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, many Members in recent years have spoken from the well of the House

about the forgotten man. I desire to talk to you today about the unforgotten man—about the man who is never forgotten by those who write the tax bills or by those who collect the taxes. This unforgotten man is the American automobile owner.

The automobile owner, as a member of a class, pays every tax that all other citizens pay. He pays income, sales, excise, and real-estate taxes. He pays taxes on cigarettes, liquor, cosmetics, admissions, furs, and jewelry. In addition to all of these taxes, the automobile owner also pays billions of dollars into the Federal Treasury each year in taxes that are levied solely and exclusively on him and him alone.

The Federal Government during the last fiscal year, collected \$607,000,000 in Federal gasoline taxes from the automobile owners of America. In addition to this gasoline tax, the Federal Government last year collected more than \$1,090,000,000 from these same automobile owners in special excise taxes on Diesel oil, tires, accessories, and new cars. In short, the Federal Government last year collected in special taxes levied solely and exclusively on automobile owners, a total of \$1,696,900,000.

Enormous and gigantic as this tax take last year from the American motorist was, it will be much greater in the year ahead.

Members of the House will recall that last year Congress over the "nay" votes of many of us enacted a new tax bill. That tax bill increased the tax on gasoline, which for many years had been 1½ cents a gallon, to 2 cents a gallon. This 33⅓ percent increase in the Federal gasoline tax went into effect November 1 of last year. Under this new and higher gasoline tax, the Federal Government will collect more than \$800,000,000 from the Nation's automobile owners during the coming year.

Last year's bill also increased the excise tax on new cars from 7 percent of the factory price to 10 percent. Excise taxes on tires and accessories also were increased. This group of new excise taxes, it is estimated, will produce a revenue of more than \$1,400,000,000 during the coming year.

In short, during the coming year, the automobile owners will pay into the Federal Treasury in special taxes levied on them and them alone a total of \$2,200,000,000.

In return for this \$2,200,000,000 in special taxes levied on the automobile owners, this bill proposes to give back to these automobile owners less than \$550,000,000 in special benefits in the form of new highway construction.

In other words, from each \$1 collected from the automobile owner in special taxes levied solely and exclusively on him, this bill proposes to give back to that automobile owner about 25 cents in benefits in the form of new or improved roads.

Of the tax dollar paid in by the automobile owner in special taxes on him and him alone, 75 cents is diverted from highway building to other purposes of Government, including foreign aid, defense, the salaries of our ever increasing

number of public officials, and other things.

In insisting on the diversion of so much of the motorists' tax dollar to other purposes than roads, the administration is most inconsistent. In some of the earlier highway bills there were clauses which said that if a State diverted any of its gasoline tax revenue or automobile license fees to any purpose other than road building that it would forfeit any Federal aid for highways to which that State might be entitled. Even at this very time, residents of New Jersey and Pennsylvania are appearing before our committee and asking that they be permitted to use tolls collected from contemplated interstate bridges to build airports, grain elevators, and other publicly owned installations. Federal administration officials are protesting these tax diversions from road purposes by the States. Yet, inconsistently, while protesting diversion by the States of any automobile tax revenue to any purposes other than roads, the Federal Government is diverting 75 cents out of every dollar it collects in special taxes from the automobile owner and even now wants to divert even more than that.

The Federal Government in Federal gasoline taxes alone will collect \$800,000,000 from the motorists but will give them back only \$550,000,000 for highways and bridges, thereby diverting \$250,000,000 of this gas tax money for the general expenses of Government.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. One dollar out of every eight dollars that is collected in the United States in taxes comes from the automobile manufacturer or the men who sell automobiles. The figure is one out of every eight dollars comes from that source.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I am quite sure the gentleman is correct.

The President in his budget message in January declared that, despite the fact that taxes on the automobile owner had been increased by \$600,000,000 during the past year, we should spend less money on our domestic highways than we have been spending.

During recent years the Congress each year has authorized the expenditure of \$500,000,000 a year for Federal aid for highway construction. Despite the fact that we will collect this year \$600,000,000 more in additional taxes than heretofore, the President in that budget message said that Federal funds authorized for highways should be cut to \$400,000,000, or by 20 percent.

In effect, the reduction as the President recommended would mean that, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, only one-half as many new miles of highway will be built during the next 2 years as during the years 1946 and 1947.

The President's recommendation was for a cut of \$100,000,000, or 20 percent, in domestic Federal highway authorizations. However, according to the evidence submitted to our committee by Commissioner of Public Roads Thomas H. MacDonald, road construction costs have increased almost 50 percent since

1946. This means that it takes \$1.50 today to build as much road as \$1 built in 1946. In other words, the reduction to \$400,000,000 recommended by the President for this bill, were it accepted, would mean we could do only as much road building as \$250,000,000 would have done in 1946. Thus the President's program, if accepted by the committee and House, would mean that only one-half as much Federal purchasing power will be available during the next 2 years for highway construction as was made available in 1946.

Now, it is not good economy to refuse to provide the money to sharpen your saw. It is not economy to refuse to repair the leak in your roof. It is not sound economy for a manufacturer to decline to spend the money necessary to keep his machinery in good repair. It is not good economy to allow the great road system of this Nation to run down and deteriorate.

The strength of America—the main source of her prosperity in time of peace and of her might in the event of war—lies in her unrivaled industrial machine which time and again has demonstrated it can produce goods in greater abundance and better quality than any industrial organization in the world.

Our highways are an integral and vital part of that industrial machine. Without our motor transportation system it would be impossible to maintain our great industrial efficiency.

Highways go where railroads, steamships, and airlines cannot go. The motor truck transports freight direct from the source of supply to the factory and from the factory to the retail outlet or even to the homes. No other transportation system can do that. It is often said there is a truck for every purpose, for little loads or big loads. No other system of transportation is so flexible. Without trucks and automobiles our industrial machine would be far less efficient than it is.

It is not economy to allow this system of truck and motor-car transportation to wear out faster than we build it.

The committee very properly, therefore, I think, rejected the President's plea that domestic road construction be reduced to one-half the 1946 level.

Instead of recommending \$400,000,000 for Federal aid to highways as the President suggested, the committee proposes \$550,000,000 in this bill which is 10 percent above the sum authorized in most years between 1946 and 1952. Even with this 10-percent increase we will be building fewer miles of Federal highways due to the 50 percent rise in construction costs which according to Road Commissioner MacDonald have occurred in recent years.

How far the administration has gone afield in its foreign mindedness is indicated by the fact that while the President recommends the domestic highway building be cut to one-half the 1946 level, he asked that vastly larger sums of the American automobile owners' tax dollars be spent to build roads in foreign countries.

While the President asked that road construction in this country be reduced to one-half the 1946 level, he asked that where we have been authorizing never more than \$8,000,000 for 2 years on Central American highways that this bill authorize \$64,000,000 for the next 2 years for Central American highways or an increase of 800 percent in foreign road construction over the last 2 years and a great decrease in the amount expended on our own domestic roads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has again expired.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The committee also rejected the President's recommendation for a vast increase in foreign road building with American taxpayers' dollars and reduced the amount it recommends for expenditures on foreign highways to \$24,000,000. Considering that even this \$24,000,000 is three times what was authorized for the past 2 years, it still is a pretty high figure, and one that can be, in my opinion, trimmed with benefits toward keeping our budgetary condition much sounder than it is.

The President recommended \$64,000,000 be authorized for new highway construction in Central American countries.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am sure you do not want the Members to think that the President recommended 800 percent additional money for the Pan-American Highway. We made a commitment of \$65,000,000. We have expended \$8,000,000, or almost that. The recommendation is for \$8,000,000 a year until the project is completed. If you want to waste money and slow down construction that you undertake, I do not care what it is, you certainly cannot save money. If you have a given project for \$56,000,000, that is what you are committed to.

Mr. MACK of Washington. We are committed to this amount of money over a long period of years. The President recommends that we spend it right away.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If we string out the number of years it will cost us more than \$56,000,000.

Mr. MACK of Washington. That might be true of the domestic program also. If we would spend a billion or two billion on domestic highways, we might proceed with greater efficiency and accomplish more than by appropriating less.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There is not any question about it.

Mr. MACK of Washington. We have not done that for the domestic highways, and I do not see why we should do it for highways in foreign countries financed by American taxpayers' dollars.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am wondering if the gentleman, in his opinion, would say that that program to spend \$56,000,000 in the near foreseeable future is profitable. That is 28 times as much as they have been getting at any other time.

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is true.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Certainly, if they are going to have \$56,000,000 instead of \$4,000,000, I do not think we should authorize a different program.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman from Ohio has complimented the Bureau of Public Roads for the efficient manner in which it constructs highways. That is their recommendation. They are the most technical men we have.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I do not agree with them because I admire them. People will make mistakes and I will disagree with them. Certainly I disagree with them in this instance.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman said they were efficient.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The President recommended \$56,000,000 for the Inter-American Highway and \$8,000,000 additional for the Rama Road, or a total of sixty-four million. The committee, in this bill, limited the amount to \$24,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. In 1950 the Inter-American Highway got \$8,000,000. That was \$4,000,000 a year. I can see no reason why we should grant to the highways in Central America more money proportionally than we are granting to our own people. I am willing that the Central American countries receive the same as they got in 1951 just as are the people of the United States.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. In this specific situation you have a commitment of \$56,000,000 to finish the project. You can drag it out and give them \$1,000,000 a year, and at the end of the time it will cost double \$56,000,000. When you expedite a construction job you are saving money. When you delay it you are wasting money. That is what is proposed right here. They are not giving them \$56,000,000 for 1 year. They recommend fifty-six million for 7 years. You want to draw it out to 14 years.

Mr. DONDERO. If we were right in 1950, then we ought to be right now. They got \$4,000,000 a year under that bill. This bill gives them \$3,000,000.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Now they have become organized. They have the equipment. More countries have joined in this program and they want to finish it. I assume that is what you want to do. You talk about efficiency and you talk about economy. If you can tell me one thing that you can construct and have any economy shown where you delay the construction, I would like to know what that project would be.

Mr. DONDERO. May I say that they are getting \$4,000,000 a year under the old bill and they kept right on constructing the road. This will continue construction; it will not slow it down.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The six Central American countries have a population of 9,000,000 people. The six New England States have about the same population, although New England, of course, does have a great many more cars than Central America.

During the past 2 years the six New England States received Federal grants of about \$48,000,000 for highway purposes. The six Central American countries in those same 2 years had Federal grants of \$8,000,000.

The President's proposal of a 20-percent reduction in Federal funds for domestic highways means that he believes Federal grants to the six New England States should be cut by \$9,000,000.

While favoring cutting the money available for the six New England States by \$9,000,000, the President wants to increase the highway grants to the South American countries from \$8,000,000, the sum allowed for the past 2 years, to \$64,000,000 for the next 2 years, an increase of \$56,000,000.

A proposal that road building in New England with 9,000,000 people be cut by \$9,000,000 and that the 9,000,000 people of the Central American nations be granted an increase of \$56,000,000 just does not make sense to me.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 7340, would continue without substantial change from the pattern established by Congress under the Federal-Aid Highway Acts of 1944, 1948, and 1950, the Federal-aid highway program.

There is ample proof of the need for expediting the highway-construction program. During the war and for some time after the war, when road construction and improvement was practically at a standstill, the already inadequate system of highways became rapidly worse and definitely unable to carry safely and quickly the ever-increasing volume of traffic imposed upon it.

Maryland is particularly aware of these conditions, because of the tremendous increase in traffic on Route 1, one section of which provides the main artery of traffic from Baltimore to Washington. The traffic problem on this road is unique, as it is the main entrance to the Nation's Capital from the northeastern section of the country.

The present route, linking the North to the Capital, is one of the most heavily traveled and most dangerous highways in the country. Over 40,000 vehicles a day use this route. It has one of the highest accident and fatality rates of any comparable highways in the country, due largely to the many intersecting roads and the development of stores, private homes, and businesses along its entire length.

The amount of \$14,500,000 authorized in this bill for the Baltimore-Washington Parkway, will complete the project,

which was initiated by the Federal Government on the condition that the State of Maryland provide funds for the work from the Baltimore city line to Fort Meade, the Government to complete the section from Fort Meade to Washington. The route for the parkway from Jessups to the District line was chosen by the Government so that the road would serve the Federal installations in that area. Furthermore, it was intended as a national defense road, to connect Fort Meade and the other Government installations with Washington.

By the end of this construction season, Maryland will have completed the work on its section of the project, a distance of approximately 13 miles. Until the funds authorized in this bill are provided, the Government cannot complete its share of the work on this urgently needed highway.

This road would supplement the present route, greatly relieve the traffic congestion, and provide a through way for north and south traffic to or through Washington. Therefore, I strongly urge the House to approve this appropriation which is justified not only as a vital public necessity, but also as a very important defense contribution.

(Mr. GARMATZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY].

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, during 1952 the Federal Government will collect from the people of this Nation somewhere between \$2,000,000,000 and \$2,250,000,000 in gasoline and other excise taxes on automobiles and motor transport. Again in 1953 and 1954 that, at least, will be the Nation's annual income from highways.

We have before us today a so-called Federal-aid road act which proposes to appropriate approximately 25 percent of that money for construction of highways throughout the Nation.

I cannot recall any better business deal that Uncle Sam ever has made. Most certainly the diversion of 75 percent of the gross income from the Nation's roads—for only our highways make possible this income—is all that can be expected and something that only a real national emergency can justify.

The people of the country, virtually all of whom pay a share of this vast sum that amounts practically to toll for use of their highways, have every right to demand that those highways shall be improved, made safer, and the mileage increased in keeping with the economic development of the Nation. They want and need highways which will carry efficiently and expeditiously the enormous burden imposed on them by the defense effort which their country in making to insure freedom and future security.

H. R. 7340, which we are considering today, authorizes the use of \$550,000,000 a year for that purpose. By no stretch of the imagination, by no contribution by the engineering genius that has made America great, can we hope to keep our Nation's highway system apace with the demands upon it with so-called Federal

aid in the amount of \$550,000,000. Only the present defense emergency can justify so small an amount of aid to the States in their struggle to build the roads that are so vitally essential to every citizen.

And the Federal Government denies to the States the same right to divert funds, which theoretically and equitably should be devoted to construction and maintenance of highways—funds which come from the same source as those collected by the Federal Government.

Back in 1934, under the terms of the Hayden-Cartwright Act, the Federal Government said to the States: "You cannot divert gasoline tax and similar excise funds from the construction and maintenance of your highways. If you do, you will receive none of the Federal funds which are to be allocated. That will be the penalty you will pay, even though your own citizens have paid their share of the money into the Federal Treasury."

If that pattern were to be followed by the Federal Government, this Nation would have highways, primary, secondary, farm-to-market, and urban, that would go far toward the solution of our transport and safety problems.

It is well to bear in mind also that so-called Federal aid does not extend to the maintenance of our highways—just to their construction. Highway maintenance costs to the States during 1951 are estimated to have been between \$550,000,000 and \$600,000,000—the full amount which we are today proposing to return to those States as the so-called Federal aid contribution. On that basis, therefore, we merely are paying enough to keep up the highways already built.

Because of that, our highway system has been deteriorating instead of improving, if we consider the over-all picture. The Federal Government has prevented, through parsimony, the construction of roads of the type which would carry the enormous traffic burden and stand up under the strain. Maintenance costs, therefore, have been far greater than they should have been.

It is true the authorization in this bill is 10 percent greater than that in the last one. Still, that is not ample if we take into consideration the fact that highway construction costs—just as all others—have increased between 12 and 15 percent since the last so-called Federal-aid bill was passed in 1950. Even simple arithmetic will show that fewer miles of highways can be built with the funds made available under this bill than were constructed with the funds authorized 2 years ago.

Under normal conditions, in the absence of any emergency such as we have today in international affairs, so-called Federal aid in the amount of \$550,000,000 would be entirely inadequate. In my opinion, the citizens of this country who pay gasoline and other excise taxes in the belief that they are making a contribution toward better highways are entitled to a greater utilization of their money for that specific purpose.

After long and careful consideration of the question, the Public Works Committee has reached the determination

that the amount authorized by this bill is the absolute minimum that can be authorized under existing conditions for so-called aid to the States. I feel that we would be remiss in our duty and our obligation to the people if we were to fail to authorize this amount.

Let us consider for a moment the factor of safety. An ever-mounting toll of human lives is being taken annually on our highways—too large a percentage of those lives being taken by antiquated roads. There are too many sharp curves and narrow bridges on our present highways. Under present traffic conditions they are veritable death traps. In 1951, according to our National Safety Council, there were more than 8,000,000 highway accidents in our country. In those accidents more than 37,000 lines were lost and more than a million persons were injured. The property damage caused, it is estimated, will not be far from the \$1,500,000,000 mark. That is about three times what we are grudgingly proposing to return to the highway users in fiscal year 1953 to build better and safer roads.

In view of that national tragedy, how anyone could object to the provisions of this so-called Federal-aid road bill is inconceivable. No one in this House desires economy in government more than do I, but it must be real economy—not mere dangerous and damaging fund cutting just for the sake of expediency, political or otherwise.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with the colloquy the gentleman from New Mexico had with our two good friends, the gentleman from New Mexico has been in the construction business all his life, as I remember.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Since I was 13 years of age I have been in the construction business, and I am still in the construction business.

Mr. McCORMACK. And on a large scale.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I would not say too large; I had the little job of building subways in New York City.

Mr. McCORMACK. How many subways?

Mr. DEMPSEY. About three in New York.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is pretty large, I would say.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let us forget the personal angle; I was considering only the problem we had with this Congress committed to the building in part of the Pan-American Highway. The proportionate participations were set up; we understand that, and we are committed to \$56,000,000.

The Bureau of Public Roads advises me that they are equipped now to go ahead, and they want the authorization; that is all. We in the committee thought we should authorize the \$56,000,000 at this time, but the majority of the committee recommended \$8,000,000 annually for the next 2 years. The vote was in favor of that situation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. By one vote; is not that the record?

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is not my recollection; but if the gentleman from Ohio says it was by one vote, then I am sure it was by one vote.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is correct.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman from Ohio has had considerable experience in the construction business himself. Can the gentleman visualize a road program such as the Pan-American Highway being slowed down without the construction costs going up, especially when it is stretched out 14 years?

Mr. McGREGOR. I want to say to my distinguished friend from New Mexico that we are not slowing it down. We gave them \$4,000,000 last year; we give them the same amount this year and next. That certainly is not slowing it down. I contend that if we cannot buy the material for our own roads in the United States, let us not help those fellows any more than we help our own people.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If we make a commitment with a sovereign state I am sure we should try to keep that commitment. We have made a commitment with these nations. Now they are gradually coming in more and more on the work and doing their share. Are you going to cut down our aid when that happens?

Mr. McGREGOR. If the gentleman will yield, we have never made a commitment based on an annual contribution; we have made a commitment on the over-all program.

Mr. DEMPSEY. And we still owe \$56,000,000; is not that true?

Mr. McGREGOR. That is true; but I recall that some years ago we were told it would cost only \$32,000,000 to complete the whole project.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am telling the gentleman that, if we extend the time and extend the time again, the final cost will be not \$56,000,000, but double that amount. I, too, want to get the job completed for as small an amount of money as possible.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. In the committee hearings the gentleman from Ohio, interrogating Commissioner MacDonald, propounded this question—this is found on page 46 of the hearings:

Mr. McGREGOR. Are you taking the position we should reduce the allocation of funds for roads in the United States and send \$64,000,000 down to Latin America for roads there?

Mr. MacDonald. I am taking the position that we should help construct the Inter-American Highway. That amount of \$56,000,000 will extend over anywhere from an 8- to a 10-year period.

If, therefore, they have a construction program, let us pursue the program, instead of establishing a new one, by reducing the amount of the annual contribution even though it does not reduce the total amount to be expended on the project.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman, and it is exactly what I am trying to say. When

you have a big job, such as confronts us in these countries in South America, if you can speed the program up and go ahead with it, that is economy, but when you attempt to do what you are trying to do here, that is extravagance and waste.

Mr. McGREGOR. From my distinguished friend's reading, Mr. MacDonald said this \$56,000,000 or \$64,000,000 would extend over 8 or 10 years. Experience has proven to me that if I give my boy \$5 and put it in his pocket and ask him to spend, that over a year or 5 years, it would be better to give him a dollar a year. I do not think we can give those countries any more for the entire program because they will come back in 4 years and say: "Well, we have made a mistake, give us another \$20,000,000."

Mr. DEMPSEY. The situation in connection with the gentleman's boy is not apropos of this one because you have given him the money for no specific purpose. This is a contract we have entered into and the amount of money is definitely set out. I can understand; the way the gentleman hands out money to his son, why it would cost him \$5 more in the next few days.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The President in his budget message and in his request for this bill set up a program involving \$400,000,000. We rejected that because we did not think the program went far enough.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is true.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That was for the sake of economy and in trying to carry out the various conceivable programs.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is true.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. When we increased it, we increased the program. Why should we increase the program, then decrease the other?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. McGREGOR. The gentleman from New Mexico introduced a bill involving \$600,000,000 at one time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman tell us what effect these extraordinary and rapidly spent funds would have in those countries from the standpoint of over-stimulating their economy all at once? It seems to me you have two propositions. You have a shortage of road building material in this country. Down there they have, we will say, a limited number of people to work.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I cannot yield further. I think the gentleman from Michigan can analyze the economy of those countries as well as I can. That is something we should have taken into account when we made this agreement. Would you be for just getting out of the agreement?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not at all. In the Virgin Islands, which is our own territory, we are spending \$10,000,000 on public works, not all at once, of course, because it would wreck their economy through overstimulation of prices and wages. It would be asinine and cruci-

fyng to spend it hurriedly. We are spending it over a period of years. I am trying to find out if that is the situation in Central America. I do not know.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I am sure the gentleman does not know.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am trying to find out.

Mr. DEMPSEY. There is one thing I would like to call to the attention of the House. We have increased over the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget by some million and a half dollars the domestic part of this road bill. One of the justifiable reasons for that, in the judgment of the committee, is the great number of highway accidents we are having. More than 37,000 people were killed on our highways in the last 12 months, which is more than double the number of our men killed in Korea since the beginning of the war.

We are away behind in the construction of our highways because of the Second World War, when construction was shut down completely. We still have narrow bridges, and sharp radius curves which must be eliminated before the highways will be as safe as we desire them to be—as they must be. We cannot increase the safety of our highways by reducing the amount of money for improvements to roads and highways.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES].

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, probably there is no public works carried out by the Federal Government that is more significant than the road program. It not only enters into the social and economic welfare of our country, but must take into account the tremendous transportation system that is required for our industrial economy. This year we are proposing the biennial road bill which calls for an expenditure in the amount of \$550,000,000. This amount is broken down into three general categories of roads that are recognized under this legislation: Primary, urban, and rural. We are producing more automobiles and more vehicles than we are constructing highways upon which they can operate. It is estimated that if we were to bring the public highway system of this country up into first class order it would take approximately \$11,000,000,000. So you see that with an appropriation of this sum, even as a matching fund for supplying funds required for road construction, we still are not pursuing the problem to the extent of solving this enormous problem.

There is another aspect to this bill that I think needs extraordinary study. That is highway safety. Highway accidents are increasing year by year. In 1950 there were some 35,000 people killed upon our highways. The accident rate increased almost 50 percent from 1945 through 1951.

I would like to point out some very significant figures that relate to the increase of highway accidents that are taking place on our highways today. You

noticed, no doubt, a few days ago, there was a report that the insurance companies were naturally having to apply for increased rates due to the fact that there are increased accidents taking place. As to motor vehicle accidents in 1945 as compared with 1950, the list which was supplied by the National Safety Council showed that there had been an increase of 51 percent, from 5,500,000 in 1945 to 8,300,000 accidents in 1950. In 1950 there was a 20 percent increase in the number of fatalities. In 1951 there was an increase of some 2,500 people killed on the highways. At the present time accidents that are causing fatalities will exceed 40,000 this year. The property damage increase was 92 percent. The property damages caused on the highways last year were almost \$3,000,000,000. The total property damages being caused in highway accidents is more than we are spending on highway construction.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I wish to compliment the gentleman on his untiring efforts in behalf of the safety program. He has done an excellent job, I am sure, in his own community, and he certainly has done an excellent job in our committee.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

I hope the committee will have an opportunity to give further study to the highway safety features, because we cannot cure all the ills in highway construction since highway construction will not keep up with the increased number of casualties caused by the increased number of vehicle miles now being imposed on our highways.

I understand the desire and the anxiety of the gentleman from Ohio in regard to the total amounts involved in the Inter-American Highway. The Inter-American Highway is a program bearing a schedule of between 8 and 10 years. It is necessary that if we are to make orderly progress on the construction of that road there be \$8,000,000 available annually to give some semblance of order to the continuation of that construction. I do hope we will not have a reduction in those amounts.

You will also note from the report that we have been a little more liberal due to the fact that we have had increased costs on the forest highways or forest roads and trails and the park service roads and the parkways, Indian roads, and the public land roads. Those in addition to the three systems of roads that I described earlier bring the total amount to \$621,250,000.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The way the bill is drawn we would be doubling the amount for the Inter-American Highway but we would not be doubling the amount for the State of Alabama. How can the gentleman explain to his people the

same proportion of money going out of the country when his own people are not getting it?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. In the first place, the State of Alabama does not obtain its Federal funds due to any treaty in which the State of Alabama and the Federal Government are engaged. The second thing is the Inter-American Road is not a matching program in the sense of the scheme of the Federal highway participation program as we have had it continuously since 1916. The situations are not similar and do not bear the same analysis.

The program is going to cost an overall figure of \$64,000,000. You are not delaying paying off that obligation by dribbling it out. By delay you are increasing the total amount that is necessary to be expended to carry out our obligation there, a program that has been devised by the engineers of the respective countries to be completed in an 8- to 10-year period. We are coming back and saying, "No, you cannot complete that work. You have to do it in 16 to 17 years." I do not think that is going to be any real economy.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The amount in the bill is \$8,000,000. That is almost 50 percent as much money as the entire State of Michigan gets for all its thousands of miles of roads, while here we are granting \$8,000,000 to go to just one road. I think if you give them the same amount of money, as we did in 1950, they can continue the construction of the road without it costing any more, and I think without violating any treaty obligation whatever. We ought to do it as a matter of fairness to our own people.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Did the gentleman pursue his argument a little bit further and conclude that it is better not to have any agreement at all, and not participate in it? I am not responsible for, and was not a party to the original agreement, and neither is the gentleman from Michigan. But I would like to see the good faith of the agreement carried out to the letter, and if it is an agreement, let us pursue it and see that it is carried out and the road constructed.

Mr. DONDERO. I was not aware that there was a solemn treaty signed by our Government and the government of Nicaragua. I understood that it was a commitment by the Department of State, about which the Congress of the United States had nothing to say.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. We did not have hearings going behind the agreement but, of course, we could not use any other department of Government to make an international agreement except the Department of State. I do not know of any other way that we could.

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, if there were a treaty, then the other body at least would have acted upon it.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I cannot go back and comment on the virtues of it. I am sorry I cannot go back and relate the conditions that brought about such

an agreement between the two countries. But, if there is an agreement, and we have already been carrying out our obligation in the direction of resolving it by building a road, then let us not abandon it when it is half finished.

Mr. DONDERO. I am not advocating abandoning our agreement.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Well, we might as well say we are abandoning it, of course. If the engineers have come up with a program which they have agreed upon, naturally if we are going to use our engineers, then we had better take their advice.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I recall the gentleman reading that Mr. MacDonald said it would take 8 or 10 years to complete this program, and that a distinguished friend said a few moments ago that we would be hindering the program if we did not give them \$56,000,000 more. I cannot associate the two statements because Mr. MacDonald said even if he got his \$56,000,000, it would take 8 to 10 years to complete the program.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That is right.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I understood the gentleman said that we would have more efficiency in the construction, if Mr. MacDonald has the entire \$56,000,000 at one time.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Did I understand the gentleman from Ohio to say that the gentleman from Alabama said to give them the \$56,000,000 now?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I understood the gentleman from Alabama said we would be delaying the program, and that it was false economy if we did not give the \$56,000,000 at once.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I am sorry if the gentleman misunderstood me. I did not intend to convey the impression that I was in favor of giving the total amount now.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Perhaps I am mistaken.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. But, I am in favor of giving the \$8,000,000 annually to be available until expended, or until the road is completed.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman made no reference to \$56,000,000. He made reference to \$8,000,000 a year, and the total over 8 or 10 years, of course, would be \$56,000,000.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. That certainly was my intention.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman who was advocating cutting it on the basis of economy should know that there is no economy in it at all. It does not reduce the total amount of money that we have agreed to pay.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We have not agreed to pay anything, may I say to my distinguished friend from New Mexico, and if so I would like to see the agreement.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to proceed, I did not interrupt the gentleman from Ohio when

he was addressing the committee. I am just trying to correct some of the misstatements made by the gentleman from Ohio. I think certainly you attended the hearings, and should know that no one is trying to increase the amount of money going to those countries. We are trying to get the job done as quickly as possible. This is an extremely important road.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am wondering if the record shows at any place where we agreed to spend any amount of money on this particular highway?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Is the gentleman bringing up the question of the original agreement between the two countries?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I was trying to find out how long this so-called commitment is going to run. It started several years ago at twenty million, then thirty million, and so forth and so on.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] is rather late in bringing up the question. He has been a member of the subcommittee for a long time and has voted for it. I do not see why he should raise the question at this late date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], a member of the committee.

(Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we can get away from this other controversy and that I can devote the 5 minutes I have to the domestic road program in the United States.

Roads are the lifeblood of the Nation. Oregon, my native State, was the first State in the Union to provide a gasoline tax. It was debated rather fiercely and objected to and was said to be unconstitutional. It went to the Supreme Court of the United States. Eventually it was approved. Now I understand every State in the Union, the Territories, and the District of Columbia have gasoline taxes. As has already been pointed out, the money derived from these taxes which are imposed upon the road users, and the road users alone, the next fiscal year will be over \$2,000,000,000; perhaps \$2,200,000,000. Yet under this bill we are allowing only \$550,000,000 for the road systems throughout the United States; that is, the three major categories of roads in the United States. Only 25 percent of the total amount that is received from road users themselves. As has been brought out, the roads are wearing out much faster than we are replacing them.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. This \$2,200,000,000 is what the Federal Government gets from these automobiles?

Mr. ANGELL. That is right. The roads are wearing out twice as fast as we are replacing them. We should at least give \$1,000,000,000 a year. That would be only half the tax levied on the road users, for the maintenance, upkeep and rebuilding of roads that are going out, and putting in new roads. We cannot expend money in any method better than this. We are not taking the money out of the Federal Treasury. We are taking it out of the people who are paying a specific tax levied particularly for this purpose. We are only putting back, as I said, perhaps 25 percent of what we are taking out. Certainly, it is not economy to allow our major roads throughout the United States to wear out and not have them reproduced, when the traffic on the roads is increasing by leaps and bounds every year. Within the last few months they have taken the mail service off of the railroads in the Northwest and put it onto trucks. Trucks are replacing the railways in the handling of traffic. They are replacing use on the waterway systems of the country. We are needing roads more and more every day. Personally, I think it is false economy not to put at least 50 percent of the money we are levying on the people who use the roads back into the road themselves.

In addition to these three major systems of highways in the United States for which this \$550,000,000 is appropriated, there are some additional sums appropriated in this bill for other roads. For instance, there is an authorization of \$22,000,000 for forest highways. The Federal Government owns the larger portion of the forest in the United States. As a matter of fact, in the State of Oregon the Government owns over 50 percent of the land, and the Government owns the biggest share of the forests in the State. Much of these forests are overripe. A forest, like any other crop, after years becomes ripe, and then it will deteriorate and rot unless it is cut down and used. It is lost, then, and the economy of the country is losing to that extent.

These funds for forest roads are for the purpose of improving the highways which cross the forests, providing access roads. Access roads to these forests owned by the Federal Government so that the timber which is ripe may be marketed; and in addition to that there are improvement roads, forest trails, which are for protection of the forests from fire and protection of the forests from pests. These small authorizations are carried in this bill, and they are very vital authorizations.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. DONDERO. Following the gentleman's suggestion, does the gentleman think the time may come when this Congress will fix a certain percentage of the gas and oil tax received by the Federal Government to be returned to the States?

Mr. ANGELL. It may have to come to that.

Mr. DONDERO. We may be forced to do that.

Mr. ANGELL. In our State we are really putting back into roads practically every dollar we take from this source.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will be passed without amendments reducing the authorizations in this bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUMMA].

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Chairman, I am surprised that in this discussion of the road problem more emphasis has not been put on the turnpike. I believe a large majority of the membership of the House have taken advantage of the Pennsylvania Turnpike in some of their travels. We in Pennsylvania do not claim to be the originators of the turnpike, for they had turnpikes in Germany and Italy before our time, but even the most skeptical people are amazed at what the turnpike does. As everybody knows, New Jersey has just completed a turnpike, and its operation thus far passes their fondest hopes. Ohio is ready to build one; it is now in the discussion stage. Florida has made an inspection of the Pennsylvania Turnpike with the thought of building a similar road through the middle of Florida.

Last fall I had the privilege of arranging a trip for a delegation from Iowa to Harrisburg where the turnpike officials went through the whole deal with them and then took them over the turnpike and showed them everything that could be seen.

One of my purposes in taking this time is to extend an invitation to my fellow Members when they are in contact with their home folks to ask them whether there is a field for a turnpike in their State.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUMMA. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Can the gentleman inform the House whether or not the schedule of payments on the Pennsylvania Turnpike is according to the estimate or in advance of it?

Mr. MUMMA. I think it is at least half again and almost twice what the schedule calls for; I know that in 1 month last year the revenues doubled.

Mr. DONDERO. So the State is far ahead in its schedule of payments on its bonds?

Mr. MUMMA. Definitely.

Mr. DONDERO. I mention toll roads and the financial experience of Pennsylvania in its great turnpike as showing that people more and more are perfectly willing to pay the extra cent a mile to have a good road. This bill proposes to give the people better roads.

Mr. MUMMA. I may say in that regard that the business with which I am more or less connected has a good many trucks, not over-the-road trucks, but delivery trucks. The speed with which you can safely deliver material by truck over such a road as the turnpike is amazing, and the money for any toll is well spent. As to the advantage of such a road to the ordinary passenger car, the Members of Congress who use the turnpike are good witnesses.

In recent years there has been a great deal of discussion as to whether or not

trucks in their normal license fees to the various States pay their fair share of highway costs. With a turnpike they come much nearer doing so. It is optional whether they want to or not. Take a road like that which has low grades and plenty of width and try to pass a Greyhound bus going 80 miles an hour.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUMMA. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the gentleman will look into the record I am positive he will find that the Pennsylvania Turnpike has been one of the most successful undertakings the RFC has ever participated in since its inception. The record will show that the payments are ahead and, furthermore, as evidenced by the extension you are making into Ohio of that same turnpike, based on surveys I have made and my associates have made, it will pay right on up to Toledo and from Toledo to Detroit and from Detroit into Chicago. The revenues would astound you if you would put it into operation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUMMA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. I am told by financial experts that turnpike roads are one of the soundest and safest investments that can be made in this day and age in America.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUMMA. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I may say that our colleague from New Jersey has informed me that although the New Jersey Turnpike is new, has just been opened, they are far in advance and way ahead of any estimates in receipts.

Mr. MUMMA. I have already stated that.

Pennsylvania has found that when the eastern extension was built, which took it into Valley Forge from Harrisburg, you may say, it greatly increased the traffic on the middle section. The western section is now completed and it increases in percentage the whole traffic. Ohio will find what was shown in New York. People will want to go there. Indiana should be the next State. I am not trying to tell them how to run the State. I do think that a turnpike will more or less become a transcontinental highway, but it all depends on whether the traffic is dense enough.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GEORGE].

(Mr. GEORGE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, in the last 12 years I have had quite a little experience in my State in reference to highway affairs. I have served in an executive capacity that long in the Kansas State Highway Department. I am fairly conversant, I think, with the needs of the various highway systems throughout the United States because in that

time I have attended numerous conventions and also numerous conferences called by the officials of the various States of the United States.

We have a tremendous road problem in the United States that virtually affects all of our people. There is not a congressional district in the United States that is not vitally affected by anything we do in regard to highway legislation.

I enjoy serving on this committee. The membership on both sides of the aisle, as you can observe today, never lack for something to say. As a matter of fact, things have been rather hot sometimes; but all of the Members are honest, sincere, conscientious men, and it has really been a pleasure for me to serve with them.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I would like to say for the RECORD, as one of the members of the Public Works Committee, that we appreciate the splendid work the gentleman has been doing as a member of that committee. We have full knowledge of the gentleman's splendid background for this type of legislative work, which certainly has played a very important part as far as the functions of the committee are concerned. He is an excellent and capable member of our committee.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

There are certain things that have not been said in regard to our highway system in the United States. I refer to the vastness of the program. The public road system of the United States is considered the world's largest. It now consists of the following: 2,661,000 miles of roads and streets not on the Federal-aid system. Ninety-five percent are under the control of local units of government. Five percent are under the control of State highway departments; 416,989 miles of Federal-aid secondary roads, of which approximately one-half are under the control of State highway departments and one-half under the control of local units of government; 234,837 miles of highways on the Federal-aid primary system, under the control of the State highway departments, and the Nation's interstate system of highways totaling 37,800 miles under the control of the State highway departments, which totals slightly more than 1 percent of the total public road mileage, yet the system carries 20 percent of the Nation's motor traffic.

This vast system of public roads represents a capital investment of \$45,000,000,000 and in 1949 the needed improvements at that time, and not at some future date, were estimated to be \$41,000,000,000 and \$47,000,000,000, with \$23,000,000,000 needed on the State highway systems, both rural and urban extensions.

In 1950 the State highway departments had at their disposal approximately \$2,712,000,000 in State funds for construction and maintenance purposes and this was supplemented by \$500,000,-

000 in Federal-aid funds for construction. The total expenditures for construction and maintenance on the entire public roads system was slightly over \$4,000,000,000 per year. As you can well see, this bill that we are considering today only provides \$550,000,000 per year for this entire system.

After deducting such amounts as are needed for maintenance and considering the average life expectancy of highway improvements, it all adds up to the fact that we are not replacing our depreciation and obsolescence losses and we are losing ground as far as financing and replacing highways is concerned.

I think that is the reason that this committee did not follow the \$400,000,000 recommendation made by the Bureau of the Budget to this congressional committee. We realize that we are living in troubled times but certainly we should go ahead and do some things to protect the life and limb of our own people and to also contribute to our adequate highway transportation system.

The motor vehicle has evolved from being a luxury to one of absolute necessity and it has caused us to completely overhaul and replan our way of living. Over 95 percent of the people in this country use their automobiles now in some phase of conducting their business. In the last year we had 52,200,000 motor vehicles registered in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of the major provisions in this bill.

(Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order to propound some questions to the committee. I have, as most of you know, had an opportunity to serve at the State and county level, in both of which we were in a continual quandary about being able to cooperate with the Federal Bureau of Roads in order to secure assistance from Federal funds that I am sure the theory of the law provided.

I am particularly calling attention now to the condition that seems to exist so far as the county in which I live is concerned. In talking with our commissioners in my own county, and discussing the problem of replacing and rebuilding highways and bridges, I very frequently had them say to me, "Well, the standards that the Bureau of Roads insists upon before we can participate in Federal funds are so high and so unrealistic that it is cheaper for us to go out and do it without Federal funds than it is to comply."

Now I cannot quite see that that condition ought to prevail and I wonder if the members of the committee could enlighten me in regard to that problem.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. In answer to the gentleman, when you talk about the stand-

ards set by the Bureau of Roads, I do not think the standards are set by the Bureau of Roads. It is the American Highway Commissioners that set the standards. Am I correct in making that statement?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the commissioners make a recommendation, but the final O. K. on the specifications rests with the Public Roads Administration. The American highway engineers are simply a staff of civilian workers that have no jurisdiction over the public roads. They make recommendations to the Public Roads Administration, and then the Public Roads Administration O. K.'s the specifications.

Mr. FALLON. During the hearings of the committee somebody from the Bureau of Public Roads said the standards were acceptable; they agreed to the standards that were laid down by the State highway commissioners.

Mr. HARVEY. Let me give you an example. There came to my attention one particular instance where a new bridge was to be constructed. The old one had to be replaced. It was found on the best advice of the local county engineer that a steel culvert would be adequate and in the opinion of everybody concerned that would be the most economical fashion in which this individual replacement could be accomplished; but no, according to the commissioners, the Bureau of Roads would not agree to any program of that kind and insisted upon a costly structure. As they said, it would have cost the county more to participate in that kind of program and build their kind of structure than if they went ahead and put in an adequate structure at their own expense.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I think the gentleman's fear would have been real back in 1948 and 1949 and probably in early 1950. However, the expressions of discontent coming from local governing bodies that had the responsibility of road construction have been resolved to a great extent. I assure the gentleman I have made inquiries into the same subject and find that there are not the complaints that there were back in that time.

Mr. HARVEY. I am very much interested in the gentleman's reply. Can he enlighten me as to just what has been done?

Mr. JONES of Alabama. There has been a closer working relationship with the State highway departments, and I may say that the director of highways of the gentleman's own State of Indiana is one of the outstanding men in this work.

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Hadden. Yes; he is considered a very competent and high-class highway authority.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. By close collaboration and discussion between the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway departments that question has been resolved to a great extent.

May I say further to the gentleman that it is not altogether a question of setting standards too high. Local road districts have not been too careful in making wise planning with respect to building roads so that the maintenance costs would not be disproportionate. Building that type of roads, the maintenance cost has gone up so that the total road program cost has risen. The wisest investment made in good, sound road construction in its inception is one geared to a low-cost maintenance program.

Mr. HARVEY. I think what the gentleman has to say is partially correct. My only contention is that we should at least be realistic. Local authorities should, after all, be the best judges as to the need in individual instances.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. The experience in our State has been that our local government units, the county commissioners, have always built roads above the lowest standards the Government set; in other words, the Bureau of Public Roads has not forced our counties and our States to build above the minimum standards. We found it was a matter of good practice, especially in regard to maintenance. It pays to build adequate grades and drainage structures to carry the excessive rainfall when it does come. It saves cutting out fills.

Mr. HARVEY. May I reaffirm my position that it is not for the Bureau of Roads to set such a high standard for road or bridge construction, a standard so high that compliance becomes unrealistic, and thereby either deprive my county of its fair share of Federal funds or forces it to spend more than the amount of Federal funds it might receive in order to comply.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I want to speak particularly with reference to the proviso in the bill found on page 3, lines 6 to 19, inclusive:

Provided, That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may be transferred from the Federal-aid primary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system when such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public interest by the State highway department and is approved by the Secretary of Commerce, but this proviso shall not be construed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso of subsection (b), section 3, of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

This proviso makes it permissive for a State to transfer an amount not to exceed 25 percent of these funds from secondary to primary, and from primary to secondary. I am for this proviso. I think it is a good thing. It would help my State.

Mr. H. L. Aitken, the State engineer for Nebraska, has written concerning this proviso as follows:

It is my opinion that the language as written, if enacted into law, would apply to all Federal aid funds apportioned to the States for the improvement of roads on the Federal aid secondary system and for the improvement of roads on the Federal aid primary system, which funds are not under formal agreement between any State and the Federal Government at the time of enactment of such law.

I concur in this interpretation and it is my understanding that the Bureau of Public Roads likewise concurs.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The reason this provision is written in the bill is to take care of some States that are unable to match certain funds. It was to keep them from losing that amount of Federal aid. In other words, they could transfer from one road fund to the other, and the request has to originate from the States. So the State is protected against the Bureau making a request to them, and the Bureau also holds the veto power over an improper request from the State. I think it is a good provision.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. I agree with that. Of course, quoting from the State engineer, he said as follows:

Nebraska has a critical interest in the language in question because as the legislation as a whole now stands and in the face of our present financial condition, we face almost certain loss of a rather substantial amount, perhaps in the neighborhood of \$1,600,000 of Federal aid secondary funds on June 30, 1953.

Mr. Chairman, I am for this proviso of the bill before us.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DONDERO. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$550,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) \$247,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) \$165,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or as may hereafter be added to such system in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), as amended and supplemented by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105): *Provided*, That such funds shall be expended on the secondary and feeder roads, farm-to-market roads, rural mail routes, public school bus routes, local rural roads, county roads, township roads, and roads of the county-road class, with types of construction that can be maintained at reasonable cost to provide all-weather service, and the projects for construction shall be selected and the specifications

with respect thereto shall be determined by the State highway department and the appropriate local officials in cooperation with each other. This provision shall not be construed to modify any of the other provisions of paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), as amended by the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105).

(c) \$137,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway primary system in urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838): *Provided*, That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may be transferred from the Federal-aid primary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system when such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public interest by the State highway department and is approved by the Secretary of Commerce, but this proviso shall not be construed to alter or impair the authority contained in the last proviso of subsection (b), section 3, of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944.

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 2 years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this act.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of \$22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and (2) for forest-development roads and trails the sum of \$19,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785): *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce may incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts under the apportionment of such authorizations, and his action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost thereof: *Provided further*, That the appropriations made pursuant to authorizations heretofore, herein, and hereafter enacted for forest highways shall be considered available to the Secretary of Commerce for the purpose of discharging the obligations created hereunder in any State or Territory: *Provided further*, That the total expenditures on account of any State or Territory shall at no time exceed its authorized apportionment: *And provided further*, That appropriations for forest highways shall be administered in conformity with regulations

jointly approved by the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, owing to the fact that the bill is short, I object to that request.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that section 2 be considered as read, and if there are any amendments to that section that they may be offered at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2? [After a pause.] If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$12,000,000, which shall be used for the construction and improvement of access roads to timber and other sources of raw materials on lands to which title is vested in the United States, said amount to be available until expended: *Provided*, That the roads authorized to be constructed under this section shall be certified to the Secretary of Commerce as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense or such other official as the President may designate.

Mr. DONDERO (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this section also may be considered as read, to be printed in the RECORD, and to be open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that section 4 may be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Section 4 follows:)

SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the limitation of \$13,000,000 on the cost of construction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway prescribed by the act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 400), is hereby increased to \$14,500,000 and the additional sum of \$1,500,000 hereby authorized shall be available for contract immediately upon the passage of this act.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request with respect to section 5, that it be considered as read, printed in the *RECORD*, and open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Section 5 follows:)

Sec. 5. Recognizing the mutual benefits that will accrue to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States from the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in said Republic of Nicaragua, the construction of which road was begun and partially completed pursuant to an agreement between said Republic and the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, for completing the construction of such road, to be available until expended. No expenditure shall be made hereunder for the construction of said road until a request therefor shall have been received by the Secretary of State from the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua nor until an agreement shall have been entered into by said Republic with the Secretary of State which shall provide, in part, that said Republic—

(1) will provide, without participation of funds herein authorized, all necessary right-of-way for the construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall be of a minimum width where practicable of one hundred meters in rural areas and fifty meters in municipalities and shall forever be held inviolate as a part of the highway for public use;

(2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit any such toll to be charged for the use of said highway by vehicles or persons;

(3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly, any fee, tax, or other charges for the use of said road by vehicles or persons from the United States that does not apply equally to vehicles or persons of such Republic;

(4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance with the provisions of the Convention for the Regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened for signature at the Pan-American Union in Washington on December 15, 1943, and to which such Republic and the United States are parties; or any other treaty or international convention establishing similar reciprocal recognition; and

(5) will maintain said road after its completion in proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.

(b) The funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the terms of this act for the survey and construction of the said road from San Benito to Rama and for the survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff in the Republic of Nicaragua without being matched by said Republic, and all expenditures made under the provisions of this act for materials, equipment, and supplies, shall, whenever practicable, be made for products of the United States or of the Republic of Nicaragua.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington: Page 7, line 10, strike out section 5 and all of the following printed matter through and including line 12 on page 9 and renumber the remaining sections.

(Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, section 5 provides for the authorization of \$8,000,000 during the next 2 years for the construction of what is known as the Rama Road. The Rama Road, is no part of the Inter-American Highway. The Inter-American Highway is a 1,500-mile road that runs from the Texas border south to the Panama Canal Zone. The Rama Road is a 165-mile road that runs east and west from the coast into the interior.

Here is the history of events that led to the projection of this road. In 1913 and 1914 this country was nearing completion of the Panama Canal. There was great enthusiasm for canal building throughout the country. William Jennings Bryan, who was then Secretary of State, entered into an agreement with the President of Nicaragua to secure for the United States a perpetual right to build a canal across Nicaragua. He secured an agreement with Nicaragua under which the right to build this canal was granted to us in perpetuity. We on our part agreed to pay Nicaragua \$3,000,000 for this concession. The agreement was approved by the Senate of the United States in 1916, and the \$3,000,000 was paid to Nicaragua for the rights in perpetuity to build a canal across Nicaragua.

On May 22, 1939, President Somoza of Nicaragua wrote a letter to President Roosevelt asking if the United States could not assist Nicaragua in building a barge canal into the interior. He asked specifically only for help in a survey by the United States Army engineers to see whether such a canal was practicable. President Roosevelt said we would make the survey. We did make the survey. The engineers found that the canal was impracticable.

In 1942 the State Department said that inasmuch as we had promised to make a survey on this canal that we had incurred some obligations in the matter and, therefore, in place of building the canal said we would build a road for Nicaragua. It was estimated this canal would cost \$2,000,000. The President

took money from his emergency fund and spent \$4,000,000 on this road. The emergency fund was exhausted. Now they say \$8,000,000 more is needed. So to build this \$2,000,000 road, \$12,000,000 is needed, and here the State Department is asking the Congress for \$8,000,000 in this bill to complete this highway.

The Secretary of State, it is admitted, wrote a letter to the President of Nicaragua and said, "We will build this road." But the Secretary of State has no authority to obligate the Congress of the United States without asking the Congress to authorize the project or to make appropriations for it.

This Congress has never authorized the Rama Road project. The money to finance work on it has been taken out of the emergency funds of the President to the extent of \$4,000,000. Now the State Department in here asks for \$8,000,000 to complete this road. If the State Department is going to legislate in that manner then it is legislating and authorizing projects on the basis of writing a letter to a foreign power. The State Department as now constituted lacks the confidence of the Congress or the country. That State Department is in its expiring months. We probably are going to have a new State Department in January, whether we have a Republican President or a Democratic one.

No work has been done on this proposed Rama Road since June 30, 1948. For 4 years we have not turned a shovel full of earth on the Rama Road. Why should we rush into completing it in the last 4 months of the term of the present State Department administration. I think we ought to lay this project over without prejudice, as we sometimes say in connection with consent bills, until we have a new State Department and then have a review of the whole project.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. Is this road the gentleman is pointing out to us, for which an appropriation is asked, exclusively or entirely within Nicaragua?

Mr. MACK of Washington. It is a 165-mile road entirely within Nicaragua. It is a stub road off the Inter-American Highway. It does not go across the country from ocean to ocean.

Mr. JONAS. It is not a part of the transcontinental road at all?

Mr. MACK of Washington. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

(On request of Mr. MEADER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MACK of Washington was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. May I ask the gentleman whether this bill, if it is adopted by the House, will be the first time that the Congress has appropriated any funds for the Rama Road?

Mr. MACK of Washington. This will be the first time that the Congress of the United States has ever appropriated any money for the Rama Road.

Mr. MEADER. Up until this time then, everything has been done about the Rama Road by the President or the State Department without any authority whatever from the Congress of the United States?

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is correct.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. The bill recites the fact that mutual benefits will accrue to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States on completion of the road. What is the benefit that will accrue to the United States?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I have a letter written by the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Miller, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], chairman of our committee, and in several places in that letter he makes the statement that he does not contend this road has any value to the United States from a defense angle or from an economic angle. He merely says we ought to build the road because the Secretary of State wrote a letter stating we would build it, without getting any authorization from the Congress.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. Does the gentleman know of any justification for attempting to spend this money at this time for this purpose?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I will insert in the RECORD the letter of Mr. Miller, Assistant Secretary of State, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY], chairman of our committee. In that letter the State Department is apologetic about this whole Rama Road project. The State Department doubts whether it should have offered to build the road in the first place, but now that it made the offer, it says the Congress should back up the State Department. I think we should wait until we have a new State Department before appropriating any money for this road.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman about the constitutionality of taking public funds derived from United States taxpayers and building roads that have nothing to do with the defense of this country or any other program except just to make somebody happy in some other country?

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Roosevelt as President of the United States did have an emergency fund for defense purposes and in his opinion the road was of defense value; so he used \$4,000,000 for that purpose.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. Chairman, in justifying the expenditure for the completion of this Rama Road—and the \$8,000,000 will

complete it—there are many schools of thought behind the construction of the Rama Road. One, of course, is the building of good will with our neighbors to the south, especially Nicaragua. They have always shown that they are friends, and have proved it on many occasions. In addition to that, this road will run from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific Ocean when completed. It will be the only other means of transportation across this peninsula in case the Panama Canal is knocked out. It might be well, and I think very popular, to stand here and complain about the expenditure of money outside of this country; it is especially hard for me, because of the talk that I made in the Committee of the Whole in regard to the conditions of our road system in this; but that example has been set in the past 5 years by the expenditure of our money, our taxpayers' money, for roads in Europe, and when you talk about \$8,000,000 and you compare it with figures that I have of \$303,000,000—and that is not the total amount that is being spent in Europe today, our own money, in building highways and bridges—you can see what that means.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. On page 9 of the report the statement appears "pursuant to an agreement with said Republic of Nicaragua and the United States." Now is that anything more than a personal understanding? What is meant by the word "agreement"?

Mr. FALLON. Well, I do not know what type of an agreement it was.

Mr. HALE. It is not a treaty, is it?

Mr. FALLON. It is not a treaty, as I understand. It is a signed agreement, but not a treaty.

Mr. HALE. A signed agreement. Who signed it?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Is it not correct that it is a signed agreement between the President of Nicaragua and the Secretary of State at that time, Sumner Welles?

Mr. FALLON. I think that is correct. That was after a verbal agreement by President Roosevelt and President Simoza in 1939.

Mr. HALE. I suggest to the gentleman it would be better if the report said it was an agreement signed by such and such an individual instead of an agreement between the Republic of Nicaragua and the United States.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MACK of Washington. This obligation was incurred by the State Department in which they said they would build this road in view of their failure to build the canal. Well, there was no agreement to build the canal; it was an agreement to make a survey, and since the survey showed that it would be imprac-

ticable they said, "We will give you a road instead." The whole question involved is whether the State Department should incur various obligations without the consent of the Congress. Now they have done so in this instance, and in my opinion I think the Congress shall repudiate it.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I want to concur in the statement and say it was a written agreement between the Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, and the President of Nicaragua. Of course, if you are going to raise the question of whether or not you are going to say that the Secretary of State has any authority to write this agreement and we are not going to pay any attention to it, certainly that has application to the foreign aid bill which a number of the Members voted for.

Mr. FALLON. I will say to the gentleman, regardless of who made the agreement, is it either a good thing for this country or is it not? Let us put the value on the road. Should we have another means of transportation in case the Panama Canal is knocked out, or should we not? That is the only basis, and whose State Department it is, whether it be this one or the new one the gentleman suggested, does not make any difference to me. It is a question whether it is going to be valuable to us in time of peril.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio this question: If the State Department should write a letter to the Premier of Canada and say the United States Government will pay its share of the St. Lawrence seaway project, would that not be the same thing, and constitute an authorization by the Congress, and compel the Congress to appropriate money for a project which had never been authorized? They are both in the same category.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It certainly is not in the same category, and my distinguished friend knows that without asking that question.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of calling to the attention of the Committee of the Whole and also reminding the committee that brought in this bill, of a fact that makes me favor the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington. In fact his amendment does not go far enough.

The population of the six New England States, one of which I have the honor to represent here, and the population of the six Central American states, is approximately the same—about 9,000,000. Of course, the New England States have many, many more automobiles and return large amounts to the Federal Treasury in the form of gasoline and other taxes. During the past 2 years about \$48,000,000 was distributed in the six New England States under this program, and about \$8,000,000 to Central America. Under the President's original proposal, which has of course been modified somewhat by the committee, the six New England States would have their contribution reduced \$9,000,000 while the Central American countries would have their contribution increased from \$8,000,000

to \$64,000,000. The present bill calls for only about \$24,000,000 for Central America.

As a representative of a section of this country that is finding itself discriminated against these days, I call the attention of this Committee to these facts. Should there be a roll call or any opportunity to vote against this bill I most certainly shall do so as a protest against the continued discrimination penalizing the section of the country I represent.

(Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself in a rather peculiar position defending the proposal of spending money in foreign countries and adhering to a program that has been established by the State Department, but I am one of those individuals that, regardless of whether a Republican or Democratic leader is in the State Department, whenever a commitment is made and the man making it is in a position of authority in our Government, I think we should live up to the commitment.

My distinguished friend from Washington told you about a series of letters that went through certain secretaries of the Secretary of State. May I read to you a portion of a commitment made on April 8, 1942, signed by Sumner Welles, acting Secretary of State of the United States. It is relative to the situation in Nicaragua:

Therefore, taking into account the spirit of the communications which were exchanged on May 22, 1939 between President Somoza of Nicaragua and President Roosevelt of the United States, my Government is willing, at its own expense, to carry out the following:

(a) The construction of a highway between San Benito and Rama.

(b) The survey and recommendation of the route of a highway from Rama to El Bluff; the construction and financing of such a road being a matter for the decision of the Nicaraguan Government in the light of the survey, and no obligation in regard thereto being contemplated by this Government.

Then he goes on:

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my most distinguished consideration.

It is signed by Sumner Welles, Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America.

That, Mr. Chairman, is a definite commitment by the Secretary of State of the United States. In a period of time when you are looking for friends and the Communist philosophy is to try to tell other nations that we will not live up to our agreements, what are you going to do, when this is our neighbor?

Nicaragua has been, now is, and will continue to be a friend and neighbor of the United States. They expect us to live up to an agreement which they entered into after a series of letters. Are we going to break our word with our neighbor to the south of us when we need friends—and we do need friends? It is rather amusing to me, and I do not want to get personal, but they have raised the question of whether or not

the Congress is going to okay this treaty. Some of my good friends have been voting for European aid here for a number of years, without any kind of agreements—that we know of and that question has not been raised, and they are still voting for it—I have voted against it—so that the record may be straight on that score. But, I do think that when a commitment has been made by an official of the Government of the United States, the Secretary of State, Sumner Welles, to a neighbor to the south of us, which was given in good faith and accepted in good faith by Nicaragua that that commitment should be kept. Are you going to sell the friendship of the people of that great country for \$8,000,000. That is what it is going to cost, no more and no less. It makes no difference to me whether you want to take it in 1 year. I am willing to accept an amendment to make it biennial, if you want to. But, I think that \$8,000,000 should be spent there in order to live up to the agreement we have made with our good friends.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. FALLON. It might be well to remind the House that just last week we voted billions of dollars to go to Europe. I have just one breakdown here—the estimated cost of a highway and the improvement of the national highway in Turkey—\$58,000,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In connection with the very powerful argument being made by the gentleman from Ohio, which I think should appeal to all of us concerning the friendly relationships between Nicaragua and the United States for years, and also the fact that Nicaragua is a neighbor of ours, may I call to the attention of my colleagues that I have made speeches on several occasions on the floor of the House with reference to the unfortunate internal conditions in Guatemala, where there is a great deal of communistic domination. Unfortunately also, there is a disturbance arising in Bolivia, which we have noted recently, which of course attracts our attention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

(On request of Mr. McCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCGREGOR was allowed to proceed for five additional minutes.)

Mr. McCORMACK. In the light of the relationship of the South American countries to us, and the Western Hemisphere in general, and in the light of the good neighbor policy, or call it anything that you want to, basic common sense it seems to me would require that we do a great deal of thinking, especially in view of these known disturbances occurring in two of these countries, or at least in one of them, with one manifesting itself in South America. I would think twice before we placed ourselves in a position of

breaking a solemn agreement, which has been entered into by our country through our Department of State.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

If I may, I would just like to read to you one statement from the officials of Nicaragua:

Nicaragua understandably looks upon the agreement as a firm and binding commitment of the United States Government. It confidently expects that the Congress of the United States will honor this agreement by providing funds for its fulfillment.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman from Washington does not disregard the fact that this agreement exists, but merely believes that now is an inopportune time to spend this \$8,000,000, and he is merely asking by his amendment that it be delayed; is that not correct?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I do not know whether he said that it should be delayed. All I have to go by is the amendment and the amendment calls for striking it out. If he wants to delay it for a period of 2 years, the gentleman could offer a substitute amendment.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman's amendment provides for striking out the \$8,000,000, and that would leave it up to the discretion of another Department of State, if we have another one after January, to submit the proposition again to the Congress of the United States, if they so desire. I pointed out that no work has been done on this road since June 30, 1948, which is a period of 4 years and another year's delay will hurt nothing.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I may say to the gentleman that will not be well received by our friends in Latin America. They will take the position: "If we enter into an agreement with one administration and that changes, then our agreement is null and void."

Mr. GAVIN. I conclude that the gentleman from Washington feels that eventually this would be done?

Mr. MACK of Washington. No. The gentleman does not feel that way.

Mr. GAVIN. At the present time he does not care to spend this \$8,000,000 on the highway, and desires to delay it until a later date. Is that not a somewhat similar position of the State of Ohio and the State of Pennsylvania on this turnpike matter? Was there not some sort of agreement that when Pennsylvania extended the turnpike to the Ohio line, the State of Ohio would immediately go ahead and complete the job across the State of Ohio, but now the State of Ohio, as I read in the press some time ago, is in a controversy about the details and have not proceeded to expedite the building of this highway across the State of Ohio.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Now, the gentleman is bringing in a friendly controversy between the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the State of Ohio. I

know nothing about it, except that the Ohio Turnpike up until recently has not been able to sell their bonds. I am certain that the great States of Pennsylvania and Ohio will continue their friendly relations.

Mr. GAVIN. No doubt of that, and the turnpike will be completed in Ohio when Ohio determines what they want to do and how they want to do it.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I do want to stress this one point on this legislation: Do you think it is safe to jeopardize our position in the Latin-American countries at this period of time for \$8,000,000? The gentleman from Washington [Mr. Mack] says it may come later. Right now we need friends.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Would the gentleman take kindly to the suggestion that we cut it in two?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am perfectly in accord with that. To be honest, I have an amendment on the desk already prepared. If it is the will of this committee to give \$4,000,000 this year and \$4,000,000 next year, it is all right with me, but I do think we ought to live up to our agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Going back to my grade-school days, I was taught that there was an operation known as the Monroe Doctrine. I have always had faith in that Doctrine.

In my work in my district during the last 2 years I have carried into literally dozens and dozens of meetings a large map of the world that is about 9 by 12 feet in size, and on the map I show the direct responsibility of the United States from the standpoint of military defense, and so forth, and a big red line that encompasses all of the Western Hemisphere. I believe that this country is as much obligated to take care of the military needs of Latin-America in the event of an attack from some foreign country as is the United States to take care of the State of Michigan. We have our traditions and our treaties and our policies down through the years which obligate us to that extent.

I have never been sympathetic to many of the things we have done in Western Europe, Eastern Europe, the Middle East and the Far East. I have always advocated that what we should do first is to strengthen the United States, and secondly the Western Hemisphere. And if after that we have anything to throw away or give away or aid with, then go to the other parts of the world, always keeping within our ability to pay.

Therefore, I am opposed to completely striking out section 5. I would much prefer to see the amount in the bill reduced by 50 percent, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dondero] has just suggested; and if such an amendment is offered, I shall be glad to support that, but I am opposed to striking out section 5.

Let me go a little further. Here we have a little illustration of how deeply we have gotten into this question of the Department of State committing the United States or the Congress, morally or otherwise. It comes up in a little incident like this road project; it is up with your Lisbon Conference; it will be up with your German Conference. Just how are the commitments being made over there? What will we do about them later on? That remains to be seen; I do not know what we will do with them later on.

My father taught his 8 boys to be extremely careful in making obligations; but he said: "Once you make a financial obligation you pay the obligation even if it takes the physical heart out of your body." He taught us to be careful about making them, and then to pay them; and we have tried to do that all through our lives, and we have done a pretty good job of it, if I may brag on the bunch a little bit.

They talk about Congress making obligations; the thing I worry about is that we not only make these treaty obligations as treaties but side dish obligations, we will call them, as well. After making the treaty obligations we get out of here and take on a lot of additional obligations to such an extent that we never know exactly where we are on the spending business. The Truman doctrine is what I call a side dish obligation; the point 4 doctrine is a side dish obligation under the UNO, under the North Atlantic Treaty and so on you will find we get into these side dishes before we take care of the main obligation, the ratified treaty which is part of the supreme law of the land.

I think that we should strengthen Central America and strengthen all of Latin America, insisting that they go along with us assuming their share always, forever, and eternally, and we ought to condition what we contribute, on participation on their part.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman from Michigan feel that Congress is obligated every time the State Department writes a letter and makes a commitment? They seem to feel that when they make a commitment they are in some way obligating this Congress. I cannot accept that philosophy of government at all; I think it is a dangerous philosophy.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman more or less on that; but I hitch my vehicle to the Monroe Doctrine.

Let us go to this question of spending which our friend from New Mexico raises; suppose you go to those Latin American countries and make a supreme effort and spend the \$56,000,000 in 1 year or 2 years; you would completely wreck the economy by overstimulation of prices and wages. By overdoing the thing that way you are neutralizing all the good that you expected to do by the project. That is a very easy thing to do in any Latin-American country—I say in any Latin American country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. CRAWFORD was allowed to proceed for two additional minutes.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have that situation in our own off-shore areas where if you go spend this money too rapidly you do more harm than good.

I do not know exactly what the situation is down through Central America; I am not as well informed on the road program in those countries as the committee is, but I do not support the proposition of spending either \$56,000,000 or \$64,000,000 in an all-out straight run to get rid of the project quickly. I would first want to know what that is going to do to their economy locally; and then I would want to know something else. Leaving here by plane Saturday afternoon and returning this morning at 5 o'clock by plane I spent some intervening hours discussing the question of basic supplies which enter into the construction of these big undertakings. One of the big questions involved is the cement-productive capacity in this country to meet the needs of the obligations we are now carrying on or trying to carry on. I have been very busy laboring with the raw materials administration on this question of getting more cement capacity. They do not want to build it; we are short. Here last year and the year before you could ride all over this city looking for a bag of cement without finding one. Building roads calls for cement on a big scale. It may be that we are not in position, even if we were foolish enough to do what we are asked to do to pour \$56,000,000 of this money rapidly into Central America on a quick operating basis. That is the fundamental question I was raising a while ago. I think we ought to understand more about some of these things.

Finally, I am in favor of spending from one to two billion dollars per year on the highways of this country during the next 5 to 15 or 20 years in order to get a highway system in this country which we need as badly as we need transportation facilities. We are all bottled up and we will have a tough time catching up. I think the report shows that we need \$32,000,000,000 of highways now. We are spending four hundred or five hundred million dollars a year. When are we going to catch up with the present transportation needs of the country?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I can add anything in clarification of the question before us, but I do want to say that a treaty was entered into in 1914 between the United States and the Government of Nicaragua to build a canal across Nicaragua. The War Department, after the testimony was all in, ruled against the feasibility of a canal, but it did recommend, and that was accepted, that a road be built to connect the Pacific and the Atlantic. That is the basis for the matter that is before us today. Its basis is in a treaty signed by the parties involved and ratified by the re-

spective congresses of the countries involved.

We have two or three things to consider in this matter. First, shall we honor an obligation? That has been very ably taken care of by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Michigan. The second thing for us to consider is, Shall we protect an investment already made? During the war President Roosevelt had an emergency fund. Some of that emergency fund was put into this road. I am unable to find from the hearings the amount, but it was a considerable sum that has been invested in this road. Shall we just lay aside this investment and let the jungle get it or shall we take advantage of the money already spent and build this road on across so there will be a passageway in this area between the Atlantic and the Pacific?

The third thing for us to consider, as has already been ably put before you by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] is that in case the worst should come to the worst and hostilities come and the Panama Canal be hit or destroyed or be put out of operation and that section become inaccessible to us, then we will have this road on which to transport our men and materials quickly from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

I hope the committee will not strike out the section, as proposed by my good friend, the gentleman from Washington. I think to adopt the amendment would be going back on a commitment we have already made and it would be throwing away an investment we have already made. Also in this period of stress it would be unwise to not have a substitute way in case the Panama Canal should go out of commission. We all know that would be a prime object of attack in case of difficulties.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is not only having a substitute for the Panama Canal, but here this House just a few hours ago voted for the exportation of know-how. If we are going to utilize our know-how anywhere on earth, why not in Central and South America? Can you utilize American know-how in those areas without highways, without highways per se—not just highways as a substitute for a canal? You have to have highways if you develop a country.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman for bringing out a point that is very important, which I overlooked. Transportation in these areas is important.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Is it not about time that we got back to the Constitution in relation to this treaty business and quit this idea of some individual going out and making a treaty without any authority under the law?

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. That is what I am going to speak about.

Mr. Chairman, the Members of this House have, for many years, apparently forgotten the fact that our only excuse for being here, and our only excuse for existence, comes under the terms of the Constitution of the United States. We were created a country, and this Congress was created a Congress and given its powers by certain definite grants of power by the sovereign people of the United States. It was also placed under metes and bounds as to what it could not do as well as what it could do, and it was not at all assumed by that Constitution that it could do whatever the Constitution did not say anything about. It could only do what the Constitution told Congress it could do. The Constitution nowhere, in any place in which I have been able to find it, says that this Congress is empowered to give away the money of any taxpayer of the United States. This Congress was not empowered to take the earnings of one person and give them to any other person upon the face of the earth, under any pretext whatsoever except as clearly specified by the Constitution. It was given certain powers to raise money for the national defense, to coin money, and compound a system of weights and measures, establish the value of the currency, and to build roads. It was not, in any place that I have been able to discover, empowered to grant charity to any person whatsoever. Now we seem to have gotten so far away from that, and under the Constitution I boldly say here and now that we have no business nor power nor authority to grant any money for relief in Europe or in Nicaragua, or even to our poor in this country; none whatsoever. Such assumed power may be legal, gentlemen, but it is not constitutional. Everything that is legal is not necessarily constitutional. Some day, please God, when this Congress comes to its senses and decides to abide by its charter, and come back to the Constitution, these laws will be declared unconstitutional, as they should be.

Mr. Chairman, the executive is not the only department to arrogate powers to himself never granted by the Constitution. For many years the Congress has also assumed powers in spending the taxpayers' money which were never given to it under that great charter of our liberties.

Some day the sovereign people of this great land are going to call you to account for your malfeasance in office. And when that dread time comes, no amount of eloquence shall save you from their wrath, and the swift retribution which shall be your fate.

God speed the day when America "shall arise like a giant refreshed from sleep, and smite you hip and thigh." Gentlemen, again consider your oath of office.

(Mr. WOOD of Idaho asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer a perfecting amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGREGOR: On page 7, line 16, after the word "appropriated", strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire that both his amendments be considered at one time?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGREGOR: On page 7, line 18, after "for", strike out "completing."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simply carrying forward the position I take, and I think a number of others take, that all this money should not be expended at one time. Under the bill, as written, the Rama Road project would be paid for in 2 years at the rate of \$4,000,000 per year. I think if we can give them \$2,000,000 each year for the next two bienniums we will in fact be showing faith with Nicaragua and integrity with an agreement signed, not as my distinguished friend from Michigan said, by someone in the State Department, but signed by the Secretary of State. Certainly this Government at this critical moment does not want to get into the category of saying to Nicaragua, a friendly neighbor of ours to the south, that we are not going to abide by an agreement that was entered into by the Government of Nicaragua and the Government of the United States through the Secretary of State, not some clerk in the State Department but the Secretary of State, Sumner Welles. He entered into an agreement to construct this Rama Road at a cost of \$8,000,000. The other day we sent \$6,500,000,000 to certain countries far away, and sometimes some of us wonder how friendly they are—but here you are living up to an agreement with a nation that is friendly to the United States, a close neighbor, and a written agreement signed by our Secretary of State.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FENTON. Is it not true that a treaty was entered into in 1914 by the then Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I think that is correct.

Mr. FENTON. It was a treaty, as I understand it.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am not familiar with it, but I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania is. I certainly would take his word on that.

Mr. FENTON. That is my understanding.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. The 1940 treaty did not agree to build this Rama Road.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am not familiar with the 1940 agreement, but I did put into the RECORD, and the gentleman heard me read it, a letter from Sumner Welles, Secretary of State, and he specifically designated that we agree to construct this road. To me, this is a definite commitment from a high official, the Secretary of State of this great Government of ours.

I do not think we should cancel an agreement that we have entered into. I do not think we can afford to do it. That is the strategy of the Communists, to say that America will not live up to its agreements. Are we going to give them a field to expand in Latin America, and give them a concrete example? Sumner Welles agreed to it, and he was Acting Secretary of State.

Mr. MEADER. Is there anything in the agreement that Nicaragua is required to do except to accept our funds and accept the highway?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Evidently there was quite a lot in it, because the gentleman is familiar with the canal proposal that was entered into. Correspondence was carried on for a number of months, then they decided, "We won't ask you for the canal because it is practically impossible to build it, so we will be satisfied to forget the original agreement if you will agree to the Rama Road." That agreement was entered into, as I said repeatedly, by the Secretary of State.

Mr. FENTON. Long before Sumner Welles came into the picture, a treaty was agreed to, in 1914, as I understand it. When the War Department turned down the canal as not being feasible for construction, they decided they would go in on a treaty for the Rama Road.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I understand there was a definite agreement and commitment by this Government on the canal in 1914. I think the gentleman said 1914. Then it was said it was costing us too much money so Nicaragua agreed to release us from that agreement if we were to go ahead with the Rama road at a cost of \$8,000,000, which we agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished majority floor leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose anything serious happened to the Panama Canal. What position might we be in?

Mr. MCGREGOR. We have absolutely nothing down there which would adequately take care of any transportation between the east coast and the west coast. I have a map out in the Speaker's lobby which I have not brought into the Chamber because I did not think this was going to take up so much time. But we can show you there is no connection between the east and the west coast.

Mr. McCORMACK. Assuming that something serious happened to the Panama Canal, and this road was built, what contribution would that road make?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Everyone certainly knows that this road would be a temporary lifesaver for us.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, it would be of valuable assistance to us in case of necessity.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It certainly would, and the thing that influences me is that we should not be losing faith with the good people of Nicaragua. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts for bringing this subject to the attention of the committee. It is most important, directly and indirectly, to both Nicaragua and the United States.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Chairman, I will not use the 5 minutes, but I think for the sake of keeping the record straight, if the gentleman from Ohio or the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. FENTON, can give this House the assurance that a treaty was entered into and ratified by the Senate of the United States in accordance with the long-established procedures of this Government, then certainly there can be no objection to the position that we find ourselves in, that is, if we want to advance the diplomatic situation or what is best for our Government and our Nation. There are very few people who would disagree with my able friend, the gentleman from Ohio, or with our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. FENTON, that this perhaps is the right thing to do. I am going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. I want to repeat, and I want the RECORD to show, in my judgment it is a dangerous philosophy for any department of this Government to commit the Government of the United States to a financial obligation by simply writing a letter. Let it be in the form of a treaty so that the people of the country know about it. But here we are confronted with a different situation where only a letter has been offered in evidence, a signed letter which the then Acting Secretary of State wrote. If he can commit this Government to an obligation of eight or sixteen million dollars to build a road by simply writing a letter, then I say the procedures of this Government have to be changed because that is a dangerous philosophy. It would mean that he could commit us to any amount of debt which the people of this country might not even be able to pay.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I think there is an explanation due to the Members of the House as to what control the United States will have over the road, assuming that the Panama Canal was destroyed or interfered with. What assurance have we, if we give Nicaragua \$8,000,000 to build 165 miles of road, and if we should have difficulty in using the Panama Canal—have we any assurance other than perhaps an oral or verbal understanding, or however the understanding has been made with Nicaragua that will permit us to haul anything or take anything over that road?

Mr. DONDERO. Of course, we want Nicaragua to remain friendly to the United States. The Panama Canal is of very great importance to us. None of

us want to do anything to jeopardize the interests of our country so far as the use of the Canal is concerned in case we get into a war. Of course, nobody can assure us that the Canal is going to remain open because our enemies might cut that road and stop us from getting to the Panama Canal.

Mr. JONAS. If I may ask the gentleman another question; what is the character of the material that is going into this road—is it concrete or reinforced concrete? What is it being built of, when it seems that 165 miles of road is going to be built for \$8,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. I understand that it is a concrete road.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. The original length was supposed to be 160 miles. The road has been completed with the exception of 35 or 40 miles. It is not of concrete construction, I might say to the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. I understood that it was.

Mr. GROSS. Then how will the road handle any military traffic, if it is not of concrete? Who is going to build the dock facilities? Who is going to build the facilities that will be required at each end of that road, if it is to serve the purpose which is to be accomplished in the event that our military have to use it.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman has asked many good questions. That is what we have been discussing for a long time.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. MEADER. I object.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

(Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

It was my privilege as counsel for the Senate War Investigating Committee, to conduct an investigation of the Inter-American Highway in 1946 and 1947. A report on this investigation, filed with the Senate July 7, 1947, comments on the Rama Road project in Nicaragua, the subject matter of this amendment.

The remarks about a treaty in the debate here have been misleading, some who have spoken here have indicated that it is as a result of a treaty that the Rama Road is to be built, at a cost of \$12,000,000. There is nothing of the kind. The 1914 treaty gave the United States an option to build a canal across Nicaragua if it wanted to. That had nothing to do with the Rama Road.

The money for the Rama Road originally came out of the President's secret emergency fund. It was estimated to cost \$2,000,000. Four million United States dollars have been spent on that project. If the Secretary of State entered into any undertaking his obligation would seem have been discharged. It must have contemplated that the money would come out of that emergency fund. To the extent he has gone beyond that the action of the Secretary of State is ultra vires. This House should say so and stop these people in the executive branch of the Government from attempting to commit the United States Government when they have no power to do so.

The Rama Road has grown from a \$2,000,000 project—on which we paid \$4,000,000, which ought to have discharged any obligation—to \$12,000,000. The Bureau of Public Roads continually gets its foot in the door and then increases construction standards and consequently costs. We can go on building wider roads, with more gently sloping grades, taking out curves and putting on surfaces, and nobody knows what the end cost will be unless we have a fixed agreement.

The Rama Road project is all nebulously tied to a 1914 option we paid for once, an ultra vires, undefined promise by the State Department and an improper diversion of secret war emergency funds, without the slightest iota of consideration or approval of the Congress.

Is this the way we are running the Federal Government today? Should the House now place its stamp of approval on this loose, unbusinesslike, unauthorized executive action? The answer should be a resounding "No."

Under leave obtained in the House I include the following comment on the Rama Road from pages 44-45 of the Inter-American Highway Report of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, Eightieth Congress, first session, Report No. 440:

The other important United States road construction during the war in Central America was the Rama Road. This road extends from San Benito on the Inter-American Highway, a short distance north of Managua, Nicaragua, to Rama, a river port on the Escondido River, a distance of 160 miles. The purpose of this highway is to provide an overland route from Rama to the central and western part of Nicaragua, connecting the Atlantic and Pacific coastal sections of Nicaragua.

In 1914, the United States obtained an option to construct a canal across Nicaragua. In 1939, the Army engineers completed a survey and located a proposed canal. The estimated cost of such a canal, however, was very high and construction was not recommended. President Anastasio Somoza of Nicaragua, obtained an agreement from President Roosevelt to build the Rama Road instead of a canal. The original estimated cost of this highway, to be built to Nicaraguan highway standards, was \$2,000,000. However, the Public Roads Administration recommended that higher construction standards be used in order to provide a road less susceptible to erosion, estimating the cost of such a road at \$4,000,000. Construc-

tion standards similar to those of the Inter-American Highway, with the exception of width, were adopted. The Rama Road was to be surfaced to a 5-meter width rather than 6 meters.

Rama is a river port. Up to this point, the Escondido River channel is at least 30 feet deep, a sufficient draft for large oceangoing vessels. However, a bar at the mouth of the river, where the depth is only 12 feet, now blocks its navigation by oceangoing vessels.

Mr. E. W. James of the Public Roads Administration testified that about \$3,000,000 had been spent on this highway, and that the \$4,000,000 estimate to complete the work was no longer accurate, as it was now thought that total construction would cost approximately \$6,500,000.

The funds for the Rama Road were taken from the secret or emergency fund of the President, thereby avoiding the need for approval by, or accounting to, the Congress. Although Congress has never had an opportunity to debate the merits of the Rama road, nor even knew about it until this committee's investigation, State Department representatives take the position that the United States is committed to complete this road regardless of how high its cost may mount.

The committee does not consider either of these expenditures of United States funds sufficiently related to national defense to have justified them as proper defense expenditures in World War II. Furthermore, with respect to the Rama Road, the use of funds from the secret or emergency fund of the President, an appropriation available only for emergencies affecting the national security or defense, appears questionable.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

(Mr. FENTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly think this is a very, very fine project; it is an American project.

A few moments ago the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] mentioned the Monroe Doctrine. I had not heard of that for such a long, long time that I thought it might have been supplanted by Yalta and a lot of other treaties; but I would like to assure you, Mr. Chairman, that Nicaragua is an American country, and it is friendly to the United States.

I had the privilege a short time ago, of visiting in Nicaragua, together with Congressman JAMES, and I know something about this Rama Road and how it would help that country establish itself as one of the great countries of America.

You talk about your point 4 program throughout the world, and yet by your actions here in trying to prevent the construction of the Rama Road, you stifle the progress of a great Central American country.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly am not for throwing money all around the world; and, incidentally, I was against the point 4 program, but since it is in being in this country and we are trying to develop underdeveloped countries all over the world, I think Central America, cer-

tainly Nicaragua, is entitled to preference.

Nicaragua is really a friend of the United States, and I feel sure that it will continue as such.

This Rama Road will not only help Nicaragua economically but will also help the United States.

It could be the means of establishing a seaport on the Caribbean or eastern coast of Nicaragua, which in turn would facilitate shipping from the United States by many, many weeks. As it is now, there is only the seaport of Corinto on the Pacific coast.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time merely to reply to my good and able friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] about the Pennsylvania Turnpike. The Pennsylvania Turnpike was conceived in Pennsylvania, built and developed by the people of Pennsylvania, and it is one of the greatest investments that we have ever made.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I will agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GAVIN. I want the gentleman to know that Pennsylvania has a fine system of highways and a State highway department that turns in a fine performance; also that the Pennsylvania Turnpike is paying its way, and eventually the bonds will be retired. What will happen to the road as a toll road after that I do not know, but it is a very important highway and I sincerely hope that Ohio will expeditiously proceed with a program to build a turnpike across Ohio and that it will eventually reach all the way from New York and Philadelphia to Chicago.

My good friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] pointed out the value of this proposed Nicaraguan road from the military standpoint. The Pennsylvania Turnpike is very important from the standpoint of military value, and if we build this great turnpike across the country it will make a magnificent contribution to the military strength of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] is recognized.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, if there ever had been a treaty between the United States and Nicaragua offering to build this road, then I would say that Congress was obligated to build it. If Congress had ever appropriated any money to build this road, then I would say Congress was obligated to build it. But Congress has not appropriated any money, and there has been no treaty entered into. Even the Department of State recognizes that a mere promise by the State Department to build a road cannot bind the Congress to appropriate money to build that road. The State Department said to Nicaragua: We will build this road. Emergency fund money in Presidential funds was used to start building it. This Congress has never authorized it.

There is no military or defense benefit in this road. The State Department says so itself, and I will tell you what

the Assistant Secretary of State said to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY]:

I do not represent the road as having present military or other value.

Later in his letter to Chairman BUCKLEY, he says:

I do not attempt to justify the building of the Rama Road for direct benefits to the United States.

The only thing the Assistant Secretary of State contends is that the State Department wrote a letter in which it said the United States would build a road. I say this Congress must make the decision whether we are going to tolerate department heads writing letters and insisting the Congress must provide funds for anything and everything the State Department promises to other countries. We should either give Nicaragua no money for the road or the full amount.

There has been introduced into the argument the question of the agreement in 1914. That related to a canal across the country that it would cost \$2,000,000,000 to build. The engineers have reported it favorably. The canal involved here was a 1939 proposal and not the canal of 1914. We agreed only to make a survey for a canal, and it was shown to be impractical. Now they say: We owe them a road, because the canal project was found to be impractical.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that this Congress does not abandon the construction of the Rama Road. I do feel kindly, of course, to the McGregor substitute. I believe it has some merit. The construction costs can be spread out over a longer period of time because maybe they cannot use too much too soon. But I do feel the Congress would make a serious mistake today in the relationship between this country and our neighbors to the south by not building this road. I do not know of any time in the history of our country when we have to look to our friends and close friends than we do today.

I hope the committee will agree to the McGregor substitute and vote down the Mack amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FALLON and Mr. DONDERO.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 3, noes 78.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventeen Members are present, a quorum.

The question is on the perfecting amendment offered by the gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR]. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the perfecting amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGREGOR: Page 7, line 16, after the word "appropriated", strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert "\$2,000,000."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MCGREGOR) there were—ayes 59, noes 8.

So the perfecting amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGREGOR: On page 7, line 18, after "for", strike out "completing."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACK of Washington: On page 7, line 10, strike out section 5 and all following printed matter through and including line 12, page 9; and renumber the remaining sections.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MACK of Washington), there were—ayes 36, noes 64.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. Section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway," approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and the construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear. The expenditures authorized by this section shall be made in accordance with all provisions and limitations in section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), not inconsistent with this section."

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCGREGOR: On page 9, line 19, after "the sum of", strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$4,000,000."

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, on page 9, line 18, there is the following provision:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954.

By my amendment I am striking out the \$8,000,000 and inserting in lieu thereof \$4,000,000, which gives the Inter-American Highway the same amount of money that Congress gave it in 1950.

We are endeavoring to hold down our expenses here in the United States, and we have increased the amount of money we are spending for our own roads in the United States only 10 percent. We certainly should not double the amount of money which is being expended for the roads in Latin America. I might say that the question has been discussed here of \$8,000,000 for a period of 7 years. That amounts to \$56,000,000. This amendment of mine certainly would not hinder the construction which is already in force because they have only been receiving two or four million dollars a year. But, in the bill as written, they would be doubling that amount. I might say the question was raised that the committee voted for the \$8,000,000. The Public Works Committee amendment for \$8,000,000 that carried by one vote, defeated my amendment for \$4,000,000. My amendment carries the same amount of money as was provided in 1950. I repeat we have only increased our road funds in the United States by 10 percent over 1950. Why should we give the Latin American Highway a 100-percent increase? That is the entire program. I hope you will go along with my amendment, which gives the Latin American Highway money as was authorized in 1950.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. I notice on page 205 of the hearings you asked Mr. Miller of the State Department the following question:

Mr. MCGREGOR. Relative to the agreement, will these countries maintain those roads after the highways are built?

Mr. MILLER of the State Department. That is one of the provisions.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I am very glad the gentleman brought that out.

Mr. MEADER. I want to ask the gentleman if he can supply the House with a copy of this agreement, which requires the six nations in Central America to undertake to maintain these highways once they are built.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I do not know whether I can do that or not. It may be a matter of high priority, but I do take the word of the representatives of the State Department. I appreciate that my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, has brought out whereby upon my question they said that the Latin-American

countries would maintain the roads and that there would be no United States funds used for maintenance. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman has brought the subject to the attention of the Committee.

Mr. MEADER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether there is an agreement or any understanding at all, so far as the United States is concerned, that these six small republics will not impose onerous restrictions upon the use of the highway, once it is completed, either in the form of tolls or in the form of excessive gasoline taxes, such as they had when they had a 25-cent gasoline tax in Costa Rica in 1947 and a 50-cent tax in El Salvador.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I cannot look into the crystal ball any more than my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, can look into the crystal ball. But, to be perfectly honest and sincere about it, if this were the first time that this legislation were coming up, I would say no. But you have spent a tremendous sum of money, approximately \$40,000,000 down there, and I do not think the United States Government should be accused at this time of stopping the project. They have the equipment and it is in operation. We can show where this is not an all one-sided proposition. The various countries through which this road passes have put up about \$37,000,000 for these projects. They have assured us that they will maintain them so our problem is to keep going along and finishing the program rather than at this critical time saying that we are going to stop it.

Mr. MEADER. I was not arguing against the inter-American highway. What I was asking the gentleman is whether or not the State Department has done what they promised us from 1941 that they would do, namely, negotiate a firm agreement for the maintenance of the highway once it is completed to prevent the imposition of onerous burdens on restrictions by the unilateral action of one of these six nations.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution, and I hope he will join the gentleman from Ohio in checking on this to see if that is done. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

(Mr. DEMPSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] does not attempt to reduce the cost that the United States Government is obliged to pay for the project. He does not reduce it by one cent. He simply cuts in half the amount recommended for the respective years necessary to pay for the project, which is 7 years. This is supposed to be one of the most necessary highways for the defense of Latin America and the United States. If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] believes this is a defense highway, then perhaps we can delay it, if we know what our enemies are going to do. Otherwise delay would be dangerous.

If we adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, we not only delay the construction for 8 years but we probably will pay 50 percent more eventually than we have agreed to pay now. We are committed to \$56,000,000. The Bureau of Public Roads is the technical branch in highway construction in our Government. They recommend \$8,000,000 a year. The Bureau of the Budget recommends the same amount. I do not care whether you are constructing a chicken coop, a subway, a ship, or a highway; anytime you delay the construction you lose money. Anytime you expedite it you will save money.

This amendment is a detriment not only to the defense theory but it is not in keeping with our own agreement with South America. We have already put in \$40,000,000 and we have fifty-six million more to put in to complete our agreement. We certainly want to go through with the agreement we have made. If this was just something to save money there might be something to discuss, but there is not one dime of saving by virtue of this amendment.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FALLON. Is it not a fact that the Bureau of the Budget recommended that we put the whole 56 million in it this year?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes, they did; but we did not do it. We did not want to do that. We wanted to go along in the manner that the engineers of the Bureau of Public Roads recommended.

Something was said that we might cause inflation down there, or that we might shorten the amount of material for the United States in building this concrete highway. When have you seen a highway constructed of concrete in the United States? I do not remember when I did. They are not using concrete for construction, except for culverts and bridges and such things. They have gone into different types of construction. The sum of \$56,000,000 would not construct one-third of this road if it were concrete.

This road will do more to get strategic material for the United States than anything else, and it will do more for national defense, if we need defense. I am hoping that we will not need it, but certainly let us not weaken the project and certainly let us not have the people of South America think that we started on a project and then delayed it. If we could spend the whole \$56,000,000 in 1 year and get through with the project, I would be here recommending it, but time is of the essence in this proposition, and I would not delay it. It would be 16 years before it could be completed, under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FALLON. May I remind the gentleman of a point that was brought up on the other side that an agreement is that there will be no tolls or charges of any kind, and that the license plates of all countries will be recognized.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is agreed that the license plates will be recognized, and

there will be no tolls charged for any portion of the road.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MEADER. Does the gentleman have a copy of the agreement which makes the provision he is talking about?

Mr. DEMPSEY. Yes.

Mr. MEADER. Would the gentleman insert that in the Record, because it does not appear in the committee hearings?

Mr. DEMPSEY. I will insert it in the Record.

Mr. MEADER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I hope that the Congress will look at this from a horse-sense standpoint and vote down the gentleman's amendment.

In accordance with the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER], I incorporate herewith the statement by Mr. Edward G. Miller, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, before the Public Works Committee, which includes portions of the agreement germane to the question by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER]:

From a military point of view the highway will provide a land route to the Panama Canal and will be of value in hemispheric defense.

Finally, the Inter-American highway is not a new project. It has been the publicly announced intention of this Government, affirmed by Congress in the language of its enactments, to see its construction through to the Panama Canal. Accordingly, approximately \$40,000,000 have been appropriated by the Congress thus far for investment in the Inter-American Highway, at first for reconnaissance surveys beginning in 1930 and then with larger appropriations for construction beginning in 1941.

We are now at a point where the completion of this project is within reach. It is important to carry this work through in order that the United States, as well as the other countries, will realize the full value of the substantial investments already made in the highway.

The Department of State, therefore, supports section 4 of H. R. 6094 which authorizes \$56,000,000 to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, and Nicaragua in the survey and completion of construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of those Republics. Note that any of the funds appropriated must conform to the procedure and limitations of section 11 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1950. In brief, section 11 provides that the other cooperating Governments shall provide all necessary right of way, where practicable; will not impose any highway toll, will not levy any fee or tax on United States vehicles or persons of the United States, that does not apply to nationals; will grant reciprocal recognition of drivers' licenses and vehicle registrations; and will provide for the maintenance of the highway after its completion.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the House will not get the wrong impression from what my able friend the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. DEMPSEY] has said about delaying the building of this road. If this amendment is adopted we will be doing

exactly what we did for these people in the 1950 bill; nothing more and nothing less. There was not a single word said in 1950 when the bill was on the floor that \$4,000,000 would delay the building of the road. There was no such argument presented at all. We are doing the same by this amendment. We are giving them \$4,000,000 a year. It will not obstruct the building of the road; it will not even hinder it; they can continue with their construction just as they have been. Furthermore, if we adopt the McGregor amendment we will be doing no more or no less for the people of Nicaragua on this road than we are doing for our own people. We are not doubling the amount; if the matter stands as it is contained in the bill, we will have doubled the amount for them while the amount we are leaving for the people of the United States is exactly as it was 2 years ago, plus 10 percent.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. DEMPSEY. The gentleman certainly admits that we are committed for \$56,000,000 to complete this project. Is that right or not?

Mr. DONDERO. I understand that that is the situation.

Mr. DEMPSEY. All right; if that is the situation, they recommended 2 years ago \$4,000,000 a year. Now they have gotten organized and they can go ahead more rapidly and want to complete the road. The gentleman says there will be no hindrance if they do not get \$8,000,000 a year. The project will take just twice as long to complete if they do not get the \$8,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. So far as the amount is concerned, I may say to the gentleman from New Mexico, I know of no one who said to our committee that they had to have \$8,000,000 a year, or even the \$56,000,000 in the authorization, to permit them to continue the construction of the road.

Mr. DEMPSEY. But they could continue the construction at only half the speed. Mr. MacDonald, in the gentleman's presence, recommended \$8,000,000, did he not?

Mr. DONDERO. Perhaps he did, but I do not know of anybody else; I did not hear anybody else justify that amount.

Mr. DEMPSEY. He was speaking for the Federal Bureau of Roads, and that is the agency that is supposed to know more about this than any other agency.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think they could proceed with twice the speed they have in the past. Furthermore, the machinery and equipment they have now in operation will be used just as it has been in the last 2 years.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Does the gentleman want to double the completion time?

Mr. DONDERO. No, I do not; but I do not want to do any more for the people in Nicaragua than I do for our own people.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Can you complete it for half the amount of money we are committed to?

Mr. DONDERO. They may not be able to continue as fast as they would like to, but certainly they can continue at the rate they have been progressing in the past.

Mr. DEMPSEY. If this road is necessary to our defense, does the gentleman think its completion should be deferred 8 years?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not know that they are going to take 8 years to do it.

Mr. DEMPSEY. This is only an authorization.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. -I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I would like to say to my distinguished friend from New Mexico that I do not think that the critical material, the steel, cement, and other things that go into road construction will be available in twice the quantity they are now.

Mr. DEMPSEY. How many thousand tons of steel will be necessary?

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not know.

Mr. DEMPSEY. That is what I thought.

Mr. McGREGOR. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; I do not know.

Mr. McGREGOR. Then we are both in the same category.

Mr. DEMPSEY. No; we are not in the same category. Mr. MacDonald assured the committee that by this coming fall steel would be plentiful for highway development.

Mr. McGREGOR. I wish we might depend on that because we have had an awful time in Ohio on the turnpike because we cannot get steel.

Mr. DEMPSEY. As I remember, we pointed that out, too.

Mr. McGREGOR. I do not recall, but I will take my friend's word for it. But the point I am bringing up is that certainly Latin America cannot get facilities to double its road program and we still hold our people down in the United States as we had to 2 years ago.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Let me say to the gentleman from Ohio that here is a project the completion of which we have agreed to. The longer we put it off the more it is going to cost. I do not see how the gentleman can justify that.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the McGregor amendment.

I am in favor of the Inter-American Highway, if it is undertaken in a proper and businesslike way.

I have always thought of the Inter-American Highway as an example of an international public work which could promote international unity in this hemisphere if we would utilize it for that purpose.

As I said earlier, as counsel for the Senate War Investigating Committee, I investigated the Inter-American Highway in 1946 and 1947. Our committee studied and conducted hearings on both the efforts of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Public Roads in Central America. We also considered the work of the Export-Import Bank, the Department of State, and the numerous international conferences on the Inter-

American Highway. I personally travelled by automobile over most of the passable sections of the highway and flew over the remainder of the terrain where there are only paths or no roads of any kind.

An international transportation artery along the Central American isthmus, where no land transportation now exists, if properly designed and executed, not alone in the physical sense, but also in the political sense, could contribute immeasurably to the lasting peace and well-being of the peoples of this hemisphere.

If the nations affected worked together for their mutual benefit, each contributing what it is able to contribute, and firmly agreed in advance to maintain the highway as a great international artery of commerce, free from physical or political obstructions and burdens, then truly we would have taken a great stride toward cementing together the nations of this hemisphere by lasting ties.

This might be regarded as visionary, but I do not think so. When the nations of the world begin to emphasize the things they have in common, rather than their differences, their minds will be turned from wars because their attention will be centered upon, and their energy will be absorbed in, wealth-producing undertakings of common benefit.

The Inter-American Highway and the St. Lawrence Seaway are international public works of great promise which should be undertaken in this spirit of mutual interest.

In my opinion, these projects should be planned, built and then managed by International Commissioners. Furthermore they should be self-liquidating and be financed by bond-issues, either wholly, or to the maximum possible extent.

I found it curiously interesting that out of one of the international conferences a proposal was made somewhat along the line I have suggested. It was pointed out that the value of land adjoining the route of the highway would be enhanced, that countries which could not contribute cash could contribute land. This could be sold or leased by an Inter-American Highway commission to contribute to the liquidation of the cost of construction and maintenance of the highway. This is not unlike the land-grants which helped build the railroads in the United States.

This impressed me as a sound and businesslike approach to a very interesting experiment in international relations, which if successful might prove adaptable in other international undertakings farther from our borders.

But our State Department has displayed little interest in such an approach. It preferred instead its traditional practice of spending a dollar and getting only 10 cents worth in return.

Without looking ahead, without providing in advance by firm and enforceable agreements for the maintenance of the Inter-American Highway and the prevention of onerous tolls, excessive gasoline taxes or other possible political burdens and obstructions, it has pressed

steadily for our Government to tax its citizens to build roads in other countries. Thus we have no assurance that the highway will ever be an international artery of commerce. It may be an instrument of extortion or it may be reclaimed by the jungles as a monument to folly.

The committee report to which I have referred called attention in 1947 to the importance of this phase of the Inter-American Highway on pages 48 and 49 in the following language:

Anyone who has traveled in the Central American countries without the special blessing of the foreign offices of those countries can appreciate that border controls, such as immigration and sanitary regulations and customs inspections, may well constitute a serious obstacle to the free movement of tourists or of cargoes. The committee does not minimize the rather delicate character of any regulation or restriction on the laws (or the administration of them) relating to border controls. However, the committee believes that if this problem is to be solved it should be through an agreement entered into prior to the actual completion of the highway. Certainly, the United States should not request any of the Central American governments to limit border controls to any greater extent than the United States, itself, is willing to limit its own. However, the committee fears that unless some standard, which is made uniform for all of the countries through which the highway passes, is adopted with respect to borders controls we may finally find ourselves in the position of having created a great international public work only to see it lie idle and unused simply because we failed to provide for sensible and workable border controls.

With respect to taxes, every motor vehicle user in the United States is conscious of license fees, both for vehicle and operator, and gasoline taxes. The committee has obtained, from the State Department, a summary of the direct taxes paid in the various countries involved in this highway on gasoline, and the approximate retail price per gallon of gasoline. This table discloses that gasoline taxes range from a low of 7.95 cents per gallon in Mexico to a high of 24.19 cents per gallon in Costa Rica, and that the approximate retail price of gasoline ranges from 25 cents per gallon in Mexico to 50 cents per gallon in El Salvador and Costa Rica. It is perfectly obvious that with a highway passing through seven separate sovereignties, gasoline taxes, alone, might be imposed by any one of those sovereignties, which would be so high as to be extortionate, unless prevented by agreement.

* * * * *

Because of the fact that the Inter-American Highway passes through seven separate sovereignties and because of the continuing future need for maintenance of the highway and the prevention of the establishment of onerous restrictions on its use, and because of the international character of this undertaking, it occurred to the committee that serious and detailed consideration ought to be given to the desirability of establishing a permanent international highway commission or authority. This commission should be responsible for maintaining the highway as an international artery of commerce and for governing its use to a limited extent by coordinating and making uniform the regulations and restrictions affecting the flow of international traffic.

It seemed to the committee that a permanent international commission or authority of this character would provide the flexibility necessary to permit the high-

way to continue to be in future years the international artery of commerce which it is designed to be by meeting problems as they arise in the economic development of the countries in this hemisphere, and particularly those in Central America, which cannot possibly be foreseen by anyone at this time.

The result of a failure to meet this problem now can well be visualized by those who recall the status of highways in the United States when they were under the exclusive control of local government agencies before there was any Federal-aid program and before there were through Federal highways. In the light of the history of the development of through highways in this country, it does not require a great deal of imagination to foresee the type of highway that would result, regardless of the quality of its original construction, if no uniformity of maintenance and regulation is required with respect to the seven separate and independent sovereignties through which this highway passes.

Just as uniformity was obtained in the Federal highway aid program by commitments obtained at the time the grant of funds was extended, the committee believes that commitments from the Central American Republics will be more easily attainable prior to the expenditure of funds than after the United States contribution has been fully made.

During its hearings in September 1946, the committee sought to learn what consideration had been given by our State Department to the creation of an international highway commission. The committee discovered that no one in the State Department had given any thought at all to this proposition.

It should be recalled that in the treaty of 1936, article II provided for the creation of a technical commission for the Pan American Highway. Although the phraseology contained in that article is very broad and the authority of that commission ill-defined, it would appear that the intention was merely to create a commission for the rather limited purpose of considering ways and means of completing the connecting links between existing sections of the proposed highway. It should also be noted that that commission has never been brought into existence. The committee learned that our State Department had taken no action whatever in this matter.

The committee concludes that the State Department has failed to act diligently in the interests of the United States to solve the problems of maintenance and use of the highway after completion and to carry out the provisions of the treaty of 1936.

Mr. Chairman, I have sought to indicate my strong belief in the importance of the Inter-American Highway because of the possibilities it holds in demonstrating the steps that may be taken in the direction of peaceful, friendly, and mutually profitable relations between the peoples of the world. I regret that such cursory consideration is being given to this subject by the House in this debate. I hope some committee of the Congress will have sufficient interest in the Inter-American Highway to explore its possibilities thoroughly. If they do, I believe they will discover that the State Department is wasting a golden opportunity for the promotion of the peace, stability, and enrichment of this hemisphere and at the same time is wasting huge quantities of tax dollars.

Mr. Chairman, to encourage and assist such a congressional exploration, I include at this point in my remarks the

conclusions contained in the report to which I have referred:

INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. FERGUSON, from the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, submitted the following additional report:

THE INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Conclusions

1. The War Department should not have undertaken construction on the so-called Inter-American Highway in Central America as a war project. Thirty-six million dollars were added to the cost of World War II without contributing to the defense of the United States. Indeed, our war effort was hampered by the division of vast quantities of construction equipment, road materials, construction manpower, and shipping in 1942 and 1943, when we were facing shortages on all sides and the universal cry was "too little too late."

2. Like the Canol project—which was approved during the same period, in the spring of 1942—the War Department's Inter-American Highway project was conceived hastily and founded upon an absence of sound planning or reasoning. War Department approval was predicated almost wholly upon information supplied by the Public Roads Administration. These estimates clearly specified the conditions under which a highway could be completed within the time desired. The War Department disregarded the conditions and specifications upon which the Public Roads Administration estimates were based and ordered the highway built, notwithstanding clear evidence that it was impossible to execute the project as ordered.

3. Both before and after approval of the Inter-American Highway project, the official position of the War Department had consistently been that an overland route to the Panama Canal was not required for the logistical support of our forces in Panama. Nevertheless, the Secretary of War, on July 23, 1942, advised the Secretary of State that the construction of the Inter-American Highway was an urgent military necessity. It is clear from the evidence that the urgent military necessity was not military supply, but the promotion of continental solidarity. The committee believes that the War Department invaded the province of the State Department in certifying that the promotion of continental solidarity was an urgent military necessity. The committee further believes that defense funds and scarce manpower, materials, machinery, and shipping should not have been diverted to a project of such questionable and nebulous benefit to our war effort.

4. Execution of the project by the Army engineers was unbusinesslike. Excessive equipment rentals were paid. Records were inadequate. Supervision of contractors was ineffectual. Coordination with the United States Public Roads Administration was poor. Termination of the project was ordered belatedly. Liquidation was slow and expensive. As a result of these and other inefficiencies in handling the project, only 347 miles of road were completed at an expenditure of \$36,000,000, although it had been estimated that 905 miles of road could be completed for \$14,500,000. Only one-third of the work done by the Army engineers is estimated to be useful to the future Inter-American Highway. Much of the work done by the Army engineers was on roads which will not be used by Public Roads Administration as a part of the Inter-American Highway as presently located.

5. Some contractors' profits were excessive. General provisions to prevent inordinate profits, such as price ceilings, income taxes, and renegotiation, as applied to this project, have not proved effective to date. How-

ever, tax recoveries against some of the contractors may yet be achieved.

6. United States representatives in the State Department and the Public Roads Administration were ineffective in securing agreements for selecting a route for some sections of the Inter-American Highway. In general, the route is located through the Cordilleras Mountain Range. This necessitates tremendous cuts and fills, adds to the difficulty and cost of construction, and will result in a tortuous, winding highway traversing mountains as high as 10,000 feet. The utility of the road for commercial or defense purposes is thereby limited. If the route had been located on the Pacific coastal plain, the highway would have been straight over long stretches and traffic could move faster. Economy in the movement of heavy cargoes would result from the greater efficiency of motor vehicles at lower altitudes and from avoiding hauling heavy loads over mountains.

7. The route of the Inter-American Highway in some sections is unnecessarily circuitous. In Nicaragua, the official Inter-American Highway is routed to pass by property owned by the former President. This detour adds 42 miles to the length of the highway. In El Salvador the official Inter-American Highway route makes a detour adding 14 miles for the purpose of serving a port. In Guatemala, a wholly new route, deviating from two existing alternative routes, was selected to connect Guatemala City with the Mexican border. In all three of these instances of unnatural location of sections of the route, there was violent disagreement between the United States Public Roads Administration and the Army engineers. This resulted in an anomalous situation where two United States agencies were doing work on routes paralleling each other, while other sections of the highway, where there was no road at all, were neglected.

8. The United States, since 1942, has spent \$3,000,000 for partial construction of a 160-mile road in Nicaragua from San Benito to Rama, a river port. This project, which will cost \$6,500,000, was not approved by Congress. The funds used were taken from the so-called secret or emergency fund of the President, available only for emergencies affecting the national security or defense and not requiring detailed accounting. Another \$1,200,000 was spent by the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs between 1942 and 1944 to construct the 40-mile Lake Yojoa Road in Honduras. This was admittedly a make-work project to relieve unemployment in Honduras and did not have congressional approval. Although built at the expense of the United States, this country has no rights in these roads and there is not even any agreement that they will be maintained. Neither road is a part of the Inter-American Highway. The committee does not consider either of these expenditures of United States funds sufficiently related to national defense to have justified them as proper defense expenditures in World War II.

9. Our State Department has been remiss in failing to negotiate firm agreements providing for the maintenance of the Inter-American Highway after its completion and in guarding against prohibitive restrictions or regulations which would prevent full use of the highway. Failure to maintain any section of the highway or the imposition of onerous restrictions in any section will render the highway useless as a whole, either for commercial or defense purposes, since there are no alternate routes to the Panama Canal below El Salvador.

10. The Army engineers spent a net amount of United States funds in excess of \$33,000,000. The United States Public Roads Administration has expended approximately \$30,000,000 to date and \$8,000,000 more has

been allotted to this work. In addition, the Export-Import Bank has loaned to Mexico and the Central American Governments, principally for the construction of various sections of the Inter-American Highway, approximately \$48,000,000. Thus, a total grant of over \$74,000,000 and loans of \$48,000,000 of United States funds have been committed to this project. However, the highway is not yet half completed. In September 1946 the Public Roads Administration estimated that it would cost an additional \$65,000,000 to complete the highway, but in March 1947 the Public Roads Administration declined to give the committee any estimate of the final total cost. Accordingly, a project which was estimated in 1941 to cost the United States a total of \$20,000,000 will now cost at least \$139,000,000.

11. Immediate study should be given to the advisability of creating an inter-American highway commission or authority to be established by multilateral treaty between the interested governments. Such a commission or authority should have power to insure the maintenance and use of the highway, when completed, as an international artery of commerce and as an instrument of hemispheric defense. The results of such a study should be available prior to any further substantial commitment of United States funds to this highway.

12. This committee believes that it should not take any position on the broad question of policy as to the establishment of a through highway between North and South America at the expense of United States taxpayers. This question is within the purview of authority of other committees of the Congress.

However, if such a highway is to be built in the interest of the economic development of the American continents, to strengthen the commercial and political ties between the American nations and to promote the security and defenses of this hemisphere, then the committee believe that the manner in which this highway project is conceived and executed should be businesslike and should be calculated to achieve the objectives stated. To continue to pour out United States funds for highway developments in other countries without a firm, clear, and enforceable arrangement for insuring that the highway will, in fact, be the international artery of commerce and defense intended, as the committee's study discloses is now being done, will be an unjustifiable diversion of United States public funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McGREGOR) there were—ayes 37, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Commerce shall prepare and reexamine and revise annually a program setting forth the essential actions which are necessary to increase and promote safety on the highways, roads, and streets of the United States. This program of essential actions shall include, but shall not be limited to, the formulation of desirable uniform legislation and ordinances for enactment by States or local governments, the formulation of standards for highway construction and vehicle control from the viewpoint of safety and for safety features to be incorporated in motor vehicles, the enlistment of public support for highway safety through publicity and information campaigns and otherwise, formulation of a uniform plan for the collection and analysis of accident records, the promotion, in the school systems and elsewhere, of education in traffic safety, the promotion of uniform enforcement of traffic laws, the formulation of uniform procedures for motor-vehicle ad-

ministration, and the coordination of highway-safety activities of all Federal departments and agencies.

In the furtherance of the objectives of highway safety, the Secretary of Commerce shall, to the extent feasible, carry out such program and in so doing shall cooperate to the fullest extent possible with State, local, and private bodies devoted to the promotion of highway safety, with a view to securing Nation-wide adherence to the program adopted pursuant to this section.

(b) The Secretary of Commerce shall make an annual report to the Congress setting forth the actions taken pursuant to this section. The annual report shall include or be accompanied by the latest version of the program of essential actions prepared in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

(c) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section not to exceed \$200,000 may be expended annually out of available administrative funds authorized by the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FALLON: Page 10, line 14 strike out all of section 7 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 7. The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized and directed to assist in carrying out the action program of the President's Highway Safety Conference and to cooperate with the State highway departments and other agencies in this program to advance the cause of safety on the streets and highways: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$200,000 shall be expended annually for the purposes of this section."

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment. The amendment was adopted later by the committee because of the objection that was raised to the language now contained in the bill by many State highway commissioners. The language was not clear and they were afraid that this program on the Federal level might in some way hamper their State programs and State rights.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. My understanding is this is the committee amendment?

Mr. FALLON. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want the chairman to understand that I no longer am in sympathy with his amendment, although I am not going to oppose it at this time.

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. SITTLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SITTLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to refer briefly and with some pardonable pride at a time when we were discussing the Federal aid to roads in Nicaragua, Guatemala, Turkey, and all of the rest of the States of the United States to what can be accomplished by a State in connection with its roads.

I refer to the famous Pennsylvania Turnpike. Here is the situation in which the State recognized a need and saw an opportunity to meet it. The State set up a separate governmental commission called the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission which surveyed the route, sold the idea to the public by the sale of bonds, built the road, and is now operating the road at tremendous and thrilling profits. It has provided a badly needed service to the great trucking companies and to the great amount of traffic that travels between the eastern and western borders of our great State.

All of the income from the road goes to the maintenance of the road or to its extension, thereby guaranteeing that the funds used to pay the tolls are used for the purpose of improving the roads for others who will use them. In a time of war or military necessity this road will be a great asset. It will help to relieve some of the burden on the railroads; it will provide for more effective transportation of materials and personnel.

I would like to commend this idea to other States. New Jersey, I know, has already constructed a turnpike of its own, the revenues of which have far exceeded the estimates. I would say that in contrast to the fiasco that occurred when the States tried to build canals some 100 or 125 years ago, the feasibility of these toll roads will be determined by the ability of the planners to sell to a public, which has financial discrimination, the bonds which will pay for the roads. To any State that is faced with traffic problems of the kind that Pennsylvania was faced with where there is an overabundance of it, to any State that has need of some freedom from the congestion of traffic that must go through its borders, I commend to them a study of the accomplishments of the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission of the great State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SITTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. An investment in bonds for turnpike roads is one of the soundest investments that can be found anywhere in the United States today.

Mr. SITTLER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SITTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to join with the gentleman in complimenting the State of Pennsylvania and the country for constructing the Pennsylvania Turn-

pike. I said a while ago I hope it goes on through Ohio.

Mr. SITTLER. Not at Pennsylvania's expense, of course.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, we, the people financed it. Is it not a fact that the RFC bought the original bond issue?

Mr. SITTLER. That is true, as I understand it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And it proved to be a success, and then the people reached for the obligation.

Mr. SITTLER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And it proved one of the finest investments in the country, as our friend from Illinois said.

Mr. SITTLER. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And that is the way to build them.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SITTLER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. I would just like to add for the RECORD that the bonds of the New Jersey Turnpike Authority are selling for 106; a very excellent investment.

Mr. SITTLER. Yes; and within a short time after completion of the road.

Mr. HAND. And our traffic count is up to the estimate for 1956, although the road has been in operation but a short time.

Mr. SITTLER. Which proves that turnpikes should be built to not only meet the needs at the present time, but the creative needs that will be brought about due to the increase in the saving of time, and so on.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, whether driving a touring car or a loaded truck, if you stay off the turnpike and make that trip you pay for the turnpike without using it; therefore the tourist and the trucker goes to the turnpike because he saves more than enough operating expenses to pay the toll fee. That is the reason they use it.

Mr. SITTLER. The immutable economic laws prove that it is a sound investment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SITTLER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. Does not the gentleman know that if the Congress during a period of years had been appropriating back to the local government units the proper amount of money charged to the motorist, it would not be necessary to build the turnpikes; that the roads would already have been built?

Mr. SITTLER. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 9. That all acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect on its passage.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FALLON: On page 12, line 5, strike out all of section 9 and insert in lieu thereof:

"Sec. 9. All provisions of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20,

1944, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. This act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 634, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, having been informed, and I appreciate it very much, that a motion to recommit will be made, and in good faith, and that an effort will be made to obtain a roll call on it, in order to carry out the agreement made heretofore I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR REMAINDER OF WEEK

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a brief announcement as to the program for the remainder of the week.

Later this afternoon a conference report will be filed on the bill S. 302, and that conference report will be taken up tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield, what is that bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a bill that lifts the ceiling on certain cases in which the Alien Property Custodian is authorized to make settlements. It applies particularly to American women who married aliens and whose property was

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued May 29, 1952
For actions of May 28, 1952
82nd-2nd, No. 92

CONTENTS

Annual leave.....2,26	Grain-storage investiga- tion.....9	Property seizure.....5
Appropriations.....2,35	Import control.....6,17	Puerto Rico.....14
Budgeting.....15,21	Labor, migratory.....10	Road authorizations...11,12
Cheese.....17	Lands, public.....27	Shoes.....18
Cotton.....24	Lands, transfer.....4,32	Social security.....31
Defense production.....6,18	Leather.....18	Soil conservation...25,33
Education.....3	Legislative program.....20	Soybeans.....28
Expenditures.....15	Personnel.....2,19,22,23	Tobacco.....8
Farm program.....24	Potatoes.....29	Transportation.....7,13
Flood control.....2,16,25	Foreign aid.....1,30	Veterans' benefits...19,27
Flood rehabilitation.....2		Price control...6,18,28,29
Forestry.....11,12,34		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed foreign-aid bill. Senate made defense-production bill its unfinished business and Sen. Maybank inserted summary of bill. Senate committees reported independent offices appropriation bill, measures to appropriate funds for flood control and soil conservation and to make temporary appropriations pending enactment of supplemental appropriation bill, and bill to make agricultural education program available for University of Alaska. Senate committee ordered reported various transportation bills. House passed road authorization bill.

SENATE

1. **FOREIGN AID.** Passed, 64-10, with amendments H. R. 7005, to extend the Mutual Security Program for the fiscal year 1953. Agreed, 37-34, to a Long amendment reducing the appropriation authorizations by \$200,000,000. Agreed to a Ferguson amendment providing that, when a commodity authorized for procurement outside the U. S. is under domestic allocation or price controls, it shall be furnished to the recipient country in lieu of dollar grants. (pp. 6218-69.)

2. **APPROPRIATIONS.** The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 7072, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1953 (S. Rept. 1603)(p. 6216). It is understood that the Committee voted to eliminate the rider to limit the taking of annual leave and eliminated the Jensen rider to restrict the filling of vacancies in the agencies covered by the bill, but that the Committee agreed to a Ferguson amendment making a 10% reduction in the budget estimates for personal services in various agencies covered by the bill.

The Committee reported with amendments H. J. Res. 426, making temporary appropriations available pending enactment of the third supplemental appropriation bill, H. R. 6947, which is tied up in conference. That bill includes supplemental items for pay costs in this Department. (H. Rept. 1612.)(p. 6216.)

The Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 454, which provides \$20,000,000 for USDA flood rehabilitation (FMA and SCS) and \$35,000,000 for Army flood control (S. Rept. 1602)(p. 6216).

3. **EDUCATION.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment H. R. 6922, to amend Sec. 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges

of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, so as to extend the benefits of such section to certain colleges in Alaska (S. Rept. 1609) (p. 6216).

4. **LAND TRANSFERS.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported without amendment S. 2603, to return to Oregon a tract of land which had been donated to the U. S. for fish-hatchery use (S. Rept. 1610) (p. 6216).
The Committee also reported without amendment H. R. 5314, to transfer a tract of land which has been used by DEISAE for grape research to the University of California (S. Rept. 1611) (p. 6216).
5. **PROPERTY SEIZURE.** The Judiciary Committee reported with amendment S. J. Res. 158, to amend the Constitution so as to prohibit the President from seizing private property except as may be prescribed by law (S. Rept. 1606) (p. 6216).
6. **DEFENSE PRODUCTION.** S. 2594, to extend the Defense Production Act, was made the unfinished business (p. 6289). Sen. Maybank obtained consent to make a correction in the committee report and inserted a summary of the committee bill (p. 6291).
As reported, the bill extends price and wage control authority until Mar. 1, 1953, and extends authority for priorities, allocations, loans and loan guarantees, and import controls until June 30, 1953. However, the import-control provision is amended by substituting the old law (Public Law 590) for the Magnuson amendments (Sec. 104 of the Act). The bill amends the Capehart amendment to make clear that it does not apply to retailers and wholesalers; strikes out the word "hereafter" from the Herlong amendment, thus extending to all retailers and wholesalers their historical mark-up; and sets forth criteria under which price and wage controls should be suspended.
7. **TRANSPORTATION.** The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) various transportation bills, including S. 2357, amending the Interstate Commerce Act regarding the agricultural exemption clause, and S. 2653, to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the U.S. Government for its employees (p. D511).
8. **TOBACCO.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 3554, to provide that the carryover of Maryland tobacco for any marketing year shall be the quantity of such tobacco on hand in the U. S. on Jan. 1 of such marketing year (p. D510).
9. **GRAIN-STORAGE INVESTIGATION.** The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee "postponed for 2 weeks action to conclude hearings on grain shortage investigation, in order that the committee staff and the GAO have further opportunities to complete their investigations" (p. D510).
10. **MIGRATORY LABOR.** Sen. Humphrey inserted a N. J. Consumers' League resolution commending the report of the President's commission on migratory labor (p. 6215).
11. **ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS.** As reported (see Digest 90), S. 2437 authorizes appropriations for each of the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 including the following: Forest highways, \$25,000,000; forest development roads and trails, \$22,500,000; Federal-aid highways, \$270,000,000; Federal-aid secondary highways, \$180,000,000; national park roads and trails, \$10,000,000; parkways, \$10,000,000; and Indian reservation roads, \$10,000,000. It also authorizes \$50,000,000 for defense access roads.

12. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. Passed as previously amended, by a 191-30 vote, H. R. 7340, to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955 for Federal aid in road construction, including forest highways and forest roads and trails (pp. 6184-5).
13. TRANSPORTATION. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported without amendment S. 2748, authorizing Canadian vessels to transport iron ore between U. S. ports on the Great Lakes during 1952 (H. Rept. 2008)(p. 6213).
14. PUERTO RICO. Passed with amendments H. J. Res. 430, approving the Puerto Rican constitution (pp. 6185-6206).
15. BUDGETING; EXPENDITURES. Received this Department's report on obligations in excess of amounts permitted by USDA regulations promulgated pursuant to R. S. 3679 as amended by Sec. 1211 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951; to Appropriations Committee (p. 6213).
16. FLOOD CONTROL. Received this Department's survey report on the Pecos River watershed, N. Mex. and Tex.; to Public Works Committee (p. 6213).
17. IMPORT CONTROL. Rep. Eberharter spoke against Sec. 104 of the Defense Production Act, which restricts imports of cheese, etc. (pp. 6183-4).
18. SHOES; LEATHER; PRICE CONTROLS. Various members discussed business conditions in the shoe and leather industries and Rep. Varsell criticized OPS price control on shoes which he claimed was "robbing the consumer of millions of dollars" yearly. Reps. Crawford and McCulloch stated tanneries were closing because of tremendous leather price drops and both recommended that specific language be incorporated into the Defense Production Act precluding price controls on consumer items unless the President "finds and declares" that the supply is less than the demand. (pp. 6207-10).
19. PERSONNEL, VETERANS' BENEFITS. Received an American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (Madison, Wis.) petition endorsing veterans' preference for Korean veterans in competitive examinations (p. 6214).
20. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, as announced by the Majority Leader: Thurs., no business; Fri. and Sat., not in session; Mon., consent calendar, Water Pollution Control Act extension, and Korean GI bill; Tues., private calendar, cotton parity standards. Roll-call votes for Mon., Tues., Wed., will go over until Thurs. Program for remainder of week undetermined. (pp. 6207).

BILLS INTRODUCED

21. BUDGETING. H. R. 8035, by Rep. Mitchell, to amend section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, so as to enable the Comptroller General more effectively to assist the Appropriations Committees in considering the budget; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.
22. PERSONNEL. H. J. Res. 463, by Rep. Wier, providing for a joint study and investigation of the problem of integrating Federal employees into the community of Washington, to be conducted by the Civil Service Commission, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

23. **PERSONNEL.** S. 3245, by Sen. Johnston, to amend section 1 (b) (2) of the act entitled "An act to increase the basic rates of compensation of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes," approved October 24, 1951, so as to provide increases in compensation under such act for employees in grade GS-11 or above whose compensation is paid at rates other than the scheduled rates of such grade; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

24. **FARM PROGRAM; COTTON.** Rep. Gathings inserted a local newspaper article urging a movement away from a one crop, cotton economy and towards diversified farming methods in this Arkansas area (p. A3440).
25. **FLOOD CONTROL; SOIL CONSERVATION.** Rep. LeCompte inserted a letter from the Colfax Chamber of Commerce, Iowa, urging construction of two flood-control dams in the Skunk River Watershed, and an allocation of funds for a soil-conservation program (p. A3461).
26. **ANNUAL LEAVE.** Rep. Rooney inserted a Washington Post editorial praising the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for striking out the leave rider from the independent offices appropriation bill (p. A3466).
27. **VETERANS' BENEFITS.** Extension of remarks by Rep. Yorty in favor of H. R. 7757, granting preference to disabled veterans in making entry on public lands (p. A3477-78).
28. **SOYBEANS.** Rep. Bender inserted a statement by Adrian Joyce, of the Glidden Co., that "price regulations imposed by OPS make it impossible for processors of soybeans to operate profitably", forcing a number of them to close down (p. A3480).
29. **POTATOES.** Rep. Bender inserted an article discussing the hearing in Federal court on boxed Idaho potato ceilings (p. A3484).
30. **FOREIGN AID.** Sen. Smathers inserted a Tampa Tribune editorial opposing the House cuts in the Mutual Security bill because "there is a point at which economy ceases to be prudent" (p. A3463). Rep. Yorty inserted a Washington Post editorial (pp. A3473-74), and Sen. Moody a letter from Mrs. Robert Patterson on the same subject (p. 3484).
31. **SOCIAL SECURITY.** Rep. McGregor inserted a letter from the Ohio Public Employees Retirement board opposing H. R. 7800, to increase old-age and survivors insurance benefits, and requesting full public hearings before further action is taken (p. A3438).

BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

32. **LAND TRANSFER.** S. 1403, directing this Department to transfer to the Mayy Department a tract of land at Shumaker, Ark., formerly used by the Farm Security Administration. Approved May 26, 1952 (Public Law 362, 82nd Cong.)
33. **SOIL CONSERVATION.** S. 2569, to continue Federal administration of the Agricultural Conservation Program (PMA) for two additional years beyond Dec. 1952. Approved May 26, 1952 (Public Law 365, 82nd Cong.)
34. **FORESTRY.** S. 1517, authorizing the Department to sell without advertisement

Calendar No. 1549

82^D CONGRESS
2^L SESSION

H. R. 7340

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 29 (legislative day, MAY 28), 1952

Read twice and ordered to be placed on the calendar

AN ACT

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the
4 Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat.
5 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary
6 thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the
7 sum of \$550,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30,
8 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30,
9 1955.

1 The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be
2 available for expenditure as follows:

3 (a) \$247,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid pri-
4 mary highway system.

5 (b) \$165,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid sec-
6 ondary highway system or as may hereafter be added to such
7 system in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (b) of
8 section 3 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat.
9 838), as amended and supplemented by the Federal Aid
10 Highway Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105): *Provided*, That
11 such funds shall be expended on the secondary and feeder
12 roads, farm-to-market roads, rural mail routes, public school
13 bus routes, local rural roads, county roads, township roads,
14 and roads of the county-road class, with types of construction
15 that can be maintained at reasonable cost to provide all-
16 weather service, and the projects for construction shall be
17 selected and the specifications with respect thereto shall be
18 determined by the State highway department and the ap-
19 propriate local officials in cooperation with each other. This
20 provision shall not be construed to modify any of the other
21 provisions of paragraph (b) of section 3 of the Federal Aid
22 Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), as amended by the
23 Federal Aid Highway Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1105).

24 (c) \$137,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid high-
25 way primary system in urban areas.

1 The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year,
2 respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States
3 in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with
4 the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid
5 Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58
6 Stat. 838) : *Provided*, That not more than 25 per centum of
7 the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expend-
8 iture on the Federal-aid primary highway system or on the
9 Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may
10 be transferred from the Federal-aid primary highway system
11 for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system
12 or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for ex-
13 penditure on the Federal-aid primary highway system when
14 such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public
15 interest by the State highway department and is approved
16 by the Secretary of Commerce, but this proviso shall not be
17 construed to alter or impair the authority contained in the
18 last proviso of subsection (b), section 3, of the Federal-Aid
19 Highway Act of 1944.

20 Any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions
21 of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State
22 for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such
23 sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned re-
24 maining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse:
25 *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed

1 to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums
2 apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by
3 formal agreements with the Secretary of Commerce for the
4 improvement of specific projects as provided by this Act.

5 SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
6 of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218),
7 as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized
8 to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of
9 \$22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and
10 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and
11 (2) for forest-development roads and trails the sum of
12 \$19,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and
13 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Pro-*
14 *vided*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest
15 highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Com-
16 merce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and
17 Puerto Rico in accordance with the provisions of section 3
18 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785):
19 *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce may
20 incur obligations, approve projects, and enter into contracts
21 under the apportionment of such authorizations, and his
22 action in so doing shall be deemed a contractual obligation
23 of the Federal Government for the payment of the cost
24 thereof: *Provided further*, That the appropriations made
25 pursuant to authorizations heretofore, herein, and hereafter

1 enacted for forest highways shall be considered available to
2 the Secretary of Commerce for the purpose of discharging
3 the obligations created hereunder in any State or Territory:
4 *Provided further*, That the total expenditures on account of
5 any State or Territory shall at no time exceed its authorized
6 apportionment: *And provided further*, That appropriations
7 for forest highways shall be administered in conformity with
8 regulations jointly approved by the Secretary of Commerce
9 and the Secretary of Agriculture.

10 SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions
11 of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat.
12 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid High-
13 way Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized
14 to be appropriated the additional sum of \$12,000,000, which
15 shall be used for the construction and improvement of access
16 roads to timber and other sources of raw materials on lands
17 to which title is vested in the United States, said amount to
18 be available until expended: *Provided*, That the roads au-
19 thorized to be constructed under this section shall be certified
20 to the Secretary of Commerce as important to the national
21 defense by the Secretary of Defense or such other official as
22 the President may designate.

23 SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, im-
24 provement, and maintenance of roads and trails, inclusive

1 of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and
2 other areas administered by the National Park Service, in-
3 cluding areas authorized to be established as national parks
4 and monuments, and national park and monument approach
5 roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat.
6 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appro-
7 priated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending
8 June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending
9 June 30, 1955.

10 (b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement,
11 and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Con-
12 gress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States,
13 there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of
14 \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and
15 a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Pro-*
16 *vided*, That the limitation of \$13,000,000 on the cost of con-
17 struction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway prescribed
18 by the Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 400), is hereby
19 increased to \$14,500,000 and the additional sum of
20 \$1,500,000 hereby authorized shall be available for con-
21 tract immediately upon the passage of this Act.

22 (c) For the construction, improvement, and mainte-
23 nance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and
24 bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian
25 lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26,

1 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be
2 appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year
3 ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year
4 ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the location, type,
5 and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be
6 approved by the Secretary of Commerce before any ex-
7 penditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall
8 be under the general supervision of the Secretary of
9 Commerce.

10 SEC. 5. Recognizing the mutual benefits that will accrue
11 to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States from
12 the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in said
13 Republic of Nicaragua, the construction of which road was
14 begun and partially completed pursuant to an agreement
15 between said Republic and the United States, there is hereby
16 authorized to be appropriated, \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year
17 ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year
18 ending June 30, 1954, for the construction of such
19 road, to be available until expended. No expenditure
20 shall be made hereunder for the construction of said road
21 until a request therefor shall have been received by the
22 Secretary of State from the Government of the Republic of
23 Nicaragua nor until an agreement shall have been entered
24 into by said Republic with the Secretary of State which
25 shall provide, in part, that said Republic—

1 (1) will provide, without participation of funds
2 herein authorized, all necessary right-of-way for the
3 construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall
4 be of a minimum width where practicable of one hundred
5 meters in rural areas and fifty meters in municipalities
6 and shall forever be held inviolate as a part of the
7 highway for public use;

8 (2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit
9 any such toll to be charged for the use of said highway
10 by vehicles or persons;

11 (3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly,
12 any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of said road by
13 vehicles or persons from the United States that does not
14 apply equally to vehicles or persons of such Republic;

15 (4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of
16 vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance
17 with the provisions of the Convention for the Regulation
18 of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened
19 for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington
20 on December 15, 1943, and to which such Republic and
21 the United States are parties; or any other treaty or
22 international convention establishing similar reciprocal
23 recognition; and

24 (5) will maintain said road after its completion in

1 proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present
2 and future traffic.

3 (b) The funds appropriated pursuant to this authoriza-
4 tion shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the
5 terms of this Act for the survey and construction of the said
6 road from San Benito to Rama and for the survey but not for
7 the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff in the
8 Republic of Nicaragua without being matched by said Re-
9 public, and all expenditures made under the provisions of this
10 Act for materials, equipment, and supplies, shall, whenever
11 practicable, be made for products of the United States or of
12 the Republic of Nicaragua.

13 SEC. 6. Section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide
14 for cooperation with Central American Republics in the con-
15 struction of the Inter-American Highway", approved De-
16 cember 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), is hereby amended to
17 read as follows:

18 "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addi-
19 tion to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000
20 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for
21 the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, to be available until
22 expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the
23 Governments of the American Republics situated in Central
24 America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics

1 of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nica-
2 ragua, and Panama—in the survey and the construction of
3 the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the afore-
4 said Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the
5 appropriation for each fiscal year may be expended without
6 requiring the country or countries in which such sums may
7 be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of
8 State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in
9 such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable
10 capacity to bear. The expenditures authorized by this sec-
11 tion shall be made in accordance with all provisions and
12 limitations in section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
13 of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), not inconsistent with this section.”

14 SEC. 7. The Commissioner of Public Roads is author-
15 ized and directed to assist in carrying out the action program
16 of the President’s Highway Safety Conference and to coop-
17 erate with the State highway departments and other agencies
18 in this program to advance the cause of safety on the streets
19 and highways: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$200,000 shall
20 be expended annually for the purposes of this section.

21 SEC. 8. If any section, subsection, or other provision
22 of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circum-
23 stance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the
24 application of such section, subsection, or other provision to
25 other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

1 SEC. 9. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act
2 of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838), and
3 all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, not
4 inconsistent with this Act, shall remain in full force and
5 effect.

6 SEC. 10. This Act may be cited as the "Federal-Aid
7 Highway Act of 1952".

Passed the House of Representatives May 28, 1952.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

82^d CONGRESS
2^d SESSION

H. R. 7340

AN ACT

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

MAY 29 (legislative day, MAY 28), 1952

Read twice and ordered to be placed on the calendar



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 98

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 1952

No. 92

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose will and wisdom are supreme, we are daily beseeching Thee for divine guidance as we seek to build our beloved country on the foundation of righteousness and justice, of peace and good will.

Grant that we may live and labor for its welfare, inspired by loyalty and devotion to our glorious American tradition and by a sincere desire to maintain and enhance them.

May all our citizens be eager to express their gratitude and patriotism by making every sacrifice to defend our democracy against the forces of evil and aggression.

We pray that our hopes and longings for our country may be permeated with something more than a selfish ambition to achieve material greatness, but may it be the goal of all our aspirations to make America a God-fearing and spiritually minded Nation.

Hear us in the name of Thy Son, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

AMENDING SECTION 218 (f) OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6291) to amend section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act with respect to effective dates of agreements entered into with States before January 1, 1954.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act, as amended (relating

to the effective dates of voluntary agreements for coverage of State and local employees), is hereby amended by striking out "January 1, 1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1954."

(Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 6291 would amend section 218 (f) of the Social Security Act, which relates to the effective dates of Federal-State agreements for old-age and survivors insurance coverage of State and local government employees, so as to extend from January 1, 1953, to January 1, 1954, the period within which such coverage may be made retroactive to January 1, 1951. The effect of the bill would be to permit State and local government employees covered under an original agreement or a modification of an agreement during the year 1953 to obtain coverage retroactively to January 1, 1951, if they desired. The maximum period of retroactive coverage would be 3 years.

The Social Security Act amendments of 1950 made old-age and survivors insurance coverage available to 1,400,000 employees of State and local governments not covered by State or local retirement systems. Statutory authority is required before a State agency can enter into a coverage agreement with the Federal Security Administrator. Such agreements have been negotiated by more than three-fourths of the States. In other States plans have been made for extending old-age and survivors insurance coverage to State and local employees retroactive to January 1, 1951, but the legislatures of those States do not meet again until 1953. Consequently, under existing law a special session of the legislature would be required to enable those States to provide for their employees the advantages which would accrue from this retroactive coverage.

This bill would grant to the States which have not yet negotiated an agreement with the Federal Security Agency, and to States which may desire to extend coverage to employees not provided for in an original agreement, an additional year in which to enter into an agreement to make coverage of State

and local employees retroactive to January 1, 1951. H. R. 6291 was reported unanimously by the Ways and Means Committee, and is favored by the Federal Security Agency.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF QUALIFIED WOMEN PHYSICIANS AND SPECIALISTS IN ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2552) to authorize the appointment of qualified women as physicians and specialists in the medical services of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, insist on the House amendments thereto, agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and that conferees be appointed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, BROOKS, and SHORT.

CHEESE POLICY

(Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, in trying to work out my own position on the so-called cheese amendment to the Defense Production Act of 1951, one of the first questions I have asked myself is: How would the repeal of this section affect American agriculture—not just the dairy farmer, or the cotton farmer, or the apple grower, or any other group of agricultural producers, but American agriculture as a whole? It seems to me that the answer is plain enough. These restrictions imposed by section 104 of the Defense Production Act are hurting American agriculture, not helping it. If American agriculture is to be served, these restrictions should be removed at once.

One of the things it is awfully easy for the farmer to forget is that a considerable part of his product, by one route or another, is sold overseas. As these overseas markets shrink and as his product backs up in the pipelines of distribution, the American farmer feels the results here at home. He may never even realize that it is the loss of his foreign markets which is shrinking his cash receipts, but he will not be able to avoid the shrinkage.

Take last year for example: American farmers sold \$4,000,000,000 of their products overseas, to foreign consumers they never saw and often never knew existed. These \$4,000,000,000 accounted for 12 cents in every dollar that the American farmer earned in that year. On the other hand, American imports of agricultural products which we can grow at home amounted to about \$2,000,000,000.

Even the products that section 104 aims at protecting have regularly been on an export basis. Last year we sold the world \$25,000,000 worth of American-made cheese; in that same year, our cheese purchases from abroad amounted to \$22,000,000. Last year we sold the world about \$96,000,000 of other dairy products, while we bought about \$3,000,000 of other dairy products from abroad.

Now, section 104 is not going to destroy these foreign markets overnight. But there is no doubt of the direction in which it is headed. Section 104 has served notice on the rest of the world that, as far as the United States is concerned, it proposes to get along without foreign agricultural products wherever they interfere in any way—no matter how trivial—with home-grown products. The section has served notice on the other countries that they cannot expect to continue to earn dollars by selling their agricultural products in these markets.

As far as these foreign governments are concerned, they are not in a very different position internally than the United States. There are always pressures on their legislatures and their officials to keep out agricultural products from overseas. Whether these pressures will make headway depends partly on whether the foreign countries have the dollars to buy agricultural products and whether other countries of the world are following a protectionist policy. With section 104 on the books—denying them dollars and setting them an example on agricultural trade policy—there is no doubt of the direction in which foreign countries will move. Step by step, the American farmer will find that the overseas demand for his wheat, his cotton, his fruits, and his dairy products is shrinking. Step by step, the pressures on our domestic support programs and our domestic farm prices will increase. In the end, the American farmer will be the loser.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

THE CONSTITUTION OF PUERTO RICO

(Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to include at this point in the RECORD a letter from William Green, president, American Federation of Labor, in support of resolution approving the Constitution of Puerto Rico.)

(The letter referred to follows:)

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., May 28, 1952.
Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Majority Leader of the House,
House Office Building, the Capitol,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is my pleasure to express for the American Federation of Labor its full and complete support of Senate Joint Resolution 151, and companion resolution, House Joint Resolution 430, which would give congressional ratification to the constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

On May 22, 1952, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor voted to support the constitution of Puerto Rico. The executive council took this action after making a study of the constitution, which revealed it to be a commendable document providing a republican form of government, and fully in accordance with the United States' principles and traditions. The executive council also observed that the constitution has the support of the laboring people of Puerto Rico.

On behalf of the American Federation of Labor, I urge you to do whatever you can to obtain prompt congressional approval of the constitution in order that it may be in operation when the elections are held this fall in Puerto Rico.

That the people of Puerto Rico have met and fully complied with every requirement stipulated by the authorizing legislation, Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress, has been found by the President and so stated categorically in his message to Congress. I believe it is vitally important now for the Congress to fulfill its obligations in order that we, as a Nation, may show the world that we believe in government by consent for our own people as well as for the other peoples of the world.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

WM. GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 88]

Aandahl	Hall,	Phillips
Albert	Edwin Arthur	Potter
Allen, Calif.	Harrison, Va.	Poulson
Anfuso	Havener	Powell
Armstrong	Hillings	Prouty
Bakewell	Hoeven	Redden
Beckworth	Hoffman, Mich.	Reece, Tenn.
Blackney	Hollifield	Richards
Bonner	Holmes	Roosevelt
Boykin	Hope	Sabath
Bramblett	Horan	Schenck
Brehm	Hunter	Scott,
Brown, Ohio	Irving	Hugh D., Jr.
Buckley	Jackson, Calif.	Scrivner
Butler	Jones, Mo.	Scudder
Carlyle	Jones,	Secrest
Carrigg	Hamilton C.	Shafer
Case	Jones,	Shelley
Celler	Woodrow W.	Sheppard
Chatham	Kearney	Sieminski
Coleley	Kennedy	Sikes
Cox	Kerr	Spence
Curtis, Mo.	Kilburn	Springer
Davis, Tenn.	Kilday	Stanley
Dawson	King, Calif.	Steed
Deane	Latham	Stigler
D'Ewart	Lovre	Stockman
Dingell	Lyle	Sutton
Dolliver	McKinnon	Tackett
Dorn	McVey	Taylor
Doughton	Mack, Ill.	Thompson,
Doyle	Magee	Mich.
Durham	Marrow	Watts
Eaton	Miller, Calif.	Welch
Fisher	Miller, N. Y.	Werdel
Flood	Morano	Wheeler
Gamble	Morris	Wickersham
Gathings	Morrison	Willis
Gore	Moulder	Wolcott
Granahan	Nelson	Yates

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 315 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ACT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question of the passage of the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. McGREGOR. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McGREGOR moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 7340) to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gross) there were—ayes 36, noes 149.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and forty-five Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—aye 191, noes 30.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 302) to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 27, 1952.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, this conference report on the bill (S. 302) amending section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act merely extends the limitation, which is contained under the present law, \$5,000,000 to \$9,000,000. Furthermore, it defines the term "book value" instead of the present procedure which is used in the administration of the act as actual value. It is a unanimous conference report. Unless there is a desire on the part of some others to discuss the conference report, I shall move the previous question.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. All I want to do is to confirm the fact that the conference report is unanimous.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROVING CONSTITUTION OF COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 430).

approving the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico which was adopted by the people of Puerto Rico on March 3, 1952.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 430, with Mr. ROONEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution is brought before us today having been unanimously reported out of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Since this pertains to the approval of a constitution for a young community it is the most serious type of legislation to which we can give our attention. I am sure the Committee will give it the attention it so richly deserves.

House Joint Resolution 430 gives the approval of the Congress of the United States to the Constitution which the people of Puerto Rico have adopted under the terms of Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress.

What we have before us today is the question as to whether the people of Puerto Rico have adopted a constitution which meets the requirements laid down by Congress when Public Law 600 of the Eighty-first Congress was adopted. In order that we may answer this question, let us then first examine Public Law 600 to see what requirements it laid down for the people of Puerto Rico to abide by in their adoption of their own constitution.

In the first place, Public Law 600 of the Eighty-first Congress fully recognizing the principle of government by consent provided in section 1 that it was adopted in the nature of a compact. As a logical consequence, it then provided in section 2 that it should be submitted to the qualified voters of Puerto Rico for acceptance or rejection through an island-wide referendum conducted in accordance with the laws of Puerto Rico.

If the aforesaid Public Law 600 was approved by the people of Puerto Rico, it would then become effective. If it were rejected by the people of Puerto Rico, it would not become effective, and we would not have this document before us today.

On June 4, 1951, the people of Puerto Rico went to the polls and approved Public Law 600 by an overwhelming majority. On that day, 387,016 voters cast their ballots in favor of Public Law 600. There were 119,169 votes against. In other words, out of 506,185 votes cast, 76.5 percent were favorable to Public Law 600 and only 23.5 percent were opposed. This meant a turnout of 65 percent of the total qualified voters legally registered.

On the fairness of this referendum, a distinguished member of our committee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], rendered a report. The gentleman concluded that, in accordance with his per-

sonal observation, it was a very fair and peaceful referendum.

There can be no question as to the acceptance of Public Law 600 of the Eighty-first Congress by the people of Puerto Rico.

Having pointed out that the first requirement of Public Law 600 was thus met, let us continue to see what are the other requirements and how they have been complied with.

Under section 2 of Public Law 600, it was provided that, upon the approval of the act by the majority of the voters participating in the referendum, the Legislature of Puerto Rico was authorized to call a constitutional convention to draft a constitution for the Island of Puerto Rico. This the legislature did and elections were held for delegates to the convention on August 27, 1951. Three of the four existing political parties submitted candidates for delegates to the convention. The Puerto Rico Independence Party which polled about 10 percent of the vote cast in the previous general election held in Puerto Rico, having boycotted Public Law 600 to which they were bitterly opposed, refrained from submitting candidates for delegates to the convention. Ninety-two delegates were elected and convened on September 17, 1951.

The distinguished gentleman and scholar, member of our Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Dr. FERNÁNDEZ-HERNÁNDEZ, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, presided over the constitutional convention and merits great credit for its ultimate attainment.

The convention sat until February 6, 1952, when on a final vote, the constitution drafted by the convention was approved by 88 out of the 92 delegates. Three voted against, one was absent.

I sincerely feel that the delegates to the constitutional convention of Puerto Rico should be commended for the high conciliatory spirit they showed in compromising their differences of opinion and coming out of the convention almost unanimous in the approval of the document they had adopted in the discharge of the responsibilities they had accepted when elected by the people of Puerto Rico.

On two occasions while the constitutional convention was in session, it was visited by members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Congresswoman BOSONE, from Utah; Congressman BOW, from Ohio; and Congressman ASPINALL, from Colorado. I am sure that at the proper time during this debate they will wish to bring before you their views as to how the convention was conducted.

Section 3 of Public Law 600 provided, as a third requirement, that, upon adoption of the constitution by the people of Puerto Rico, the President of the United States would be authorized to transmit such constitution to the Congress of the United States if he found that such constitution conformed with certain requirements. Therefore, before the constitution was submitted to the President, it had to be submitted to the people of Puerto Rico and approved by them. This took place on March 3, 1952.

On that day, 374,649 votes were cast in favor of the adoption of the constitution, and 82,923 voted against its adoption. This indicates a turn-out of over 50 percent of registered voters participating, and that more than 81 percent of those participating voted for the constitution. The constitution was then presented to the President of the United States. The President has transmitted such constitution to the Congress, and in his message he states:

I do find and declare that the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico conforms with the applicable provisions of the act of July 3, 1950, and of our own Constitution.

Your committee, itself, has examined the Constitution of Puerto Rico. We found that, as provided in section 2, it created a republican form of government and included a bill of rights. Based on the democratic principle that ultimate authority rests with the people, they have created a representative government with the three classical independent branches of government—executive, legislative, and judicial.

On the Constitution of Puerto Rico, Judge George A. Malcolm, who is recognized to be one of the highest authorities in the field of constitutional law has said as I quote a translation from *El Mundo*, of San Juan, Thursday, May 8, 1952:

The Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is a good constitution, but more than that—it is a good constitution for Puerto Rico. It is a short document. It does not come to be a statute or a code. The constitution adheres to established usages. It does not contain any unusual or unheard of provisions. It creates three independent departments of equal category, as it should. Each one of the three powers would act as a check and balance on the other.

I may say that Judge George A. Malcolm was attorney general of Puerto Rico years ago as a presidential appointee after having been a justice in the supreme court of the Philippines. He is the author of various books on constitutional law and received the degree of doctor of jurisprudence of the University of Michigan. He holds other very distinguished academic titles. He is mentioned by Willowby as having written the most exhaustive study of our constitutional provisions regarding territorial powers of Congress and concerning legislation for territories.

The Constitution of Puerto Rico includes a bill of rights. All men are declared equal before the law. Separation of church and state is fully established. Freedom of speech and of the press and of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for redress of grievances is guaranteed. The right to life, liberty, and the enjoyment of property is recognized as a fundamental right of man. It is declared that no person shall be deprived of his liberty or property without due process of law. No person shall be denied the equal protection of the laws. No laws impairing the obligation of contracts shall be enacted. The right of the people to be secure in their persons

and be protected against unreasonable searches and seizures is guaranteed. Speedy and public trial in all criminal prosecutions is guaranteed to every person. In general, all the fundamental rights and immunities of a citizen guaranteed under the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States have not only been included, but expanded.

There are two other requirements in Public Law 600 which the Constitution of Puerto Rico must meet. The President has found that the constitution meets them and so does your committee so find. Such requirements are the following: First, that the constitution conforms with the applicable provisions of Public Law 600; second, that the Constitution of Puerto Rico conforms with such provisions of the Constitution of the United States as are applicable to Puerto Rico. No provision of the Constitution of Puerto Rico is in conflict with the applicable provisions of the Constitution of the United States nor does it overstep the sphere of authority granted the people of Puerto Rico to be exercised under this constitution in accordance with the provisions of the Puerto Rico Federal Relations Act which will continue to apply to Puerto Rico.

By the Puerto Rico Federal Relations Act is meant such sections of the present organic act which shall not stand repealed once the Constitution of Puerto Rico becomes effective. Under the Federal Relations Act, the rights, privileges, and immunities of the citizens of the United States shall be respected in Puerto Rico to the same extent as though Puerto Rico were a State of the Union and subject to the provisions of paragraph 1 of section 2 of article 4 of the Constitution of the United States.

The statutory laws of the United States, not locally inapplicable, with few other exceptions, shall have the same force and effect in Puerto Rico as in the United States. In other words, when we pass laws here for the United States, such laws will become, in the same way, the supreme law of the land in Puerto Rico as they are the supreme law of the land in the United States.

The legislative authority of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico under the Federal Relations Act, as it is explicitly provided, shall extend to matters of a local character. In a general way, it may be said then that the legislative powers of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are similar to those of the States of the Union within comparable limitations.

Under the Federal Relations Act, Puerto Rico will continue to be included within the United States tariff system, and the same rates of tariff shall be collected in Puerto Rico as in the United States. Puerto Rico will continue to be subject to our coastwise shipping laws and to our monetary laws. In fact, to all the laws that pertain in the Federal sphere of governmental authority. Again, under the Federal Relations Act, a United States District Court for the District of Puerto Rico shall sit in Puerto Rico with similar jurisdiction to that of the United States district courts in the United States. Appeals from the Su-

preme Court of Puerto Rico may be taken to the First Circuit Court of Boston and ultimately to the Supreme Court of the United States.

The provisions of the Federal Relations Act as continued by Public Law 600 are binding for Puerto Rico. Section 1 of the Constitution of Puerto Rico specifically states that the political power of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico shall be exercised within the terms of a compact as agreed under Public Law 600. Therefore, there is no possibility whatsoever that neither by amendment of the Constitution of Puerto Rico by the people of Puerto Rico, nor by the enactment of laws under said constitution, they may exercise powers above and beyond the limits set forth by Public Law 600, and explicitly accepted by the people of Puerto Rico.

Amendments to the Constitution of Puerto Rico may be adopted in two ways: First, by initiative of the Legislature of Puerto Rico, with subsequent approval of the people in a referendum; second, by convention subject to the ultimate approval of the people.

Having examined the Constitution, and having found that it conforms with all requirements of Public Law 600, Eighty-first Congress, and satisfied that this constitution represents the express will of the people of Puerto Rico, our approval of the constitution by Congress would signify the last step taken in the constitutional process for the creation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico by the people of Puerto Rico within the framework provided for by Public Law 600, which started with the adoption of said act.

The people of Puerto Rico are citizens of the United States and will continue to be citizens of the United States, now enjoying under both the Federal and their own local constitution the fundamental freedoms for which our citizenship stands, after 50 years of gradual but determined political progress. We have arrived at a system of relations and a system of government for Puerto Rico which fulfills their aspirations, and dispels forever any vestige of reason that might be invoked to maintain that this great Nation wishes to exercise any degree of authority over unwilling peoples and without their enjoying the basic liberties of free citizens.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman knows of certain questions which I raised at the time the rule making this resolution in order was before us. Could the gentleman say to us at this time what he proposes, or what the committee proposes in respect to an amendment to this resolution?

Mr. MURDOCK. The committee instructed the chairman to offer during the process of the discussion certain amendments to the measure before us.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand, that has to do primarily with section 20, about which there has been so much question.

Mr. MURDOCK. We found there was a good deal of opposition to section 20

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 3, 1952
For actions of June 2, 1952
62nd-2nd, No. 94

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	32	Forestry.....	2	Roads.....	6
Buildings.....	12	F. F. A.....	16	Tobacco.....	5
Census, agricultural.....	9,18	Lands, transfer.....	3,22	Transportation.....	8,11
Coconuts.....	1	Minerals.....	24	Tuna imports.....	14
Cotton.....	27	Personnel.....	15,19,23	Veterans' benefits.....	21
Credit.....	28	Potatoes.....	30	Water pollution.....	20,24
Education.....	4	Reclamation.....	7	Water research.....	17
Foreign aid.....	10,29	Reorganization.....	31	Weather control.....	13
Forest products.....	26	Research.....	3,13,17		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed bills: Reducing coconut tariff for Pacific Territory. Ready for President. Authorizing Forest Service airports. Modifying Md. tobacco quota law. Senate debated road authorization bill. House passed salt-water research bill. House debated Korean GI bill.

SENATE

1. COCONUT TARIFF. Passed without amendment H. R. 7188, to extend to coconut oil from the trust territory of the Pacific Islands the same exemption from the additional processing tax of 2 cents a pound as is provided to coconut oil from the Philippines and U. S. possessions (p. 6364). This bill will now be sent to the President.
2. FOREST AIRPORTS. Passed as reported S. 2229, to authorize this Department to acquire and operate airports near national forests (p. 6423).
3. LAND TRANSFERS. Passed without amendment S. 2603, to return to Oregon a 2-acre tract which had been donated to this Department for use as a fish hatchery (pp. 6425-6).
Discussed and passed over H. R. 5314, to donate to California University a tract of BPISAE land for grape research (pp. 6426-7).
4. EDUCATION. Passed without amendment H. R. 6922, to extend to Alaska colleges the benefits of the act of 1935 authorizing Federal contributions toward the endowment and support of agriculture and the mechanic arts (p. 6427). This bill will now be sent to the President.
5. TOBACCO. Passed as reported H. R. 3554, to change the carry-over date for Maryland tobacco from October 1 to January 1 of each year (pp. 6427-8).
6. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. Began debate on S. 2437, to authorize 1954 and 1955 appropriations for roads, including forest highways and forest roads and trails (pp. 6451-6).

7. RECLAMATION. Passed without amendment S. 2610, providing that excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to certain lands that will receive a supplemental water supply from the San Luis project, Colo. (pp. 6422-3).
Passed as reported H. R. 5633, to approve a contract with the irrigation districts on the Owyhee project (pp. 6424-5).
8. TRANSPORTATION. Passed as reported S. 2357, to provide that horticultural commodities shall be included within the term "agricultural commodities" for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers in the Interstate Commerce Act (p. 6427).
9. AGRICULTURE CENSUS. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendment S. 2903, to provide that a census of agriculture be taken in Oct. 1951 and in the same month of each tenth year thereafter (S. Rept. 1621)(p. 6374).
10. FOREIGN AID. Sens. Connally, George, Green, Wiley, and Smith of N. J. were appointed conferees on H. R. 7005, to continue the Mutual Security Program (pp. 6376-7). House conferees were appointed May 29.
11. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported without amendment S. 2653, to standardize rates on household goods shipped by the U. S. Government for its employees (S. Rept. 1625)(p. 6374).
12. BUILDINGS. Discussed and passed over H. R. 4323, to authorize GSA to enter into long-term lease-purchase agreements for buildings (p. 6420).
13. WEATHER CONTROL. Discussed and passed over H. 2225, to create a committee to study and evaluate public and private experiments in weather modification (pp. 6383-4).
14. TUNA-FISH IMPORTS. Discussed and passed over H. R. 5693, to impose a tariff on tuna-fish imports (p. 6384).
15. CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT. Sen. Robertson inserted the opening statement of Rep. Murray at the house hearings on amendments to the Civil Service Retirement Act (pp. 6377-8).
16. FUTURE FARMERS OF AMERICA. Sen. Wiley inserted a letter from the Wis. Director of Vocational and Adult Education favoring a postage stamp honoring FFA (pp. 6373-4).

HOUSE

17. SALT-WATER RESEARCH. Passed as reported H. R. 6578, to provide for correlation and coordination of research into practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other Beneficial consumptive uses. This amended version of the bill authorizes appropriation of \$1,000,000 for a 5-year period; gives the Interior Department responsibility for the project, and provides for advances of funds to other cooperating departments and agencies. (pp. 6462-3.)
18. AGRICULTURE CENSUS. Passed as reported H. R. 7202, providing for an agricultural census in Oct. 1954 and decennially thereafter (p. 6465).
19. PERSONNEL; LEAVE. Passed without amendment H. R. 7806, authorizing certain Federal employees to attend, without loss of pay or annual leave, funerals of

September 1, 1947; and (6) general officers who, subsequent to September 1, 1947, have been or who may be appointed from those officers of the Medical and Dental Corps of, or from those officers designated as medical or dental officers in, the Regular Army, the Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, the National Guard of the United States, the Army of the United States, the Regular Air Force, the United States Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force of the United States who are included in parts (1), (2), (3), or (4), of this subsection."

(b) Deleting the second proviso of subsection 203 (b) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Provided further, That the commissioned officers described in subsection (a) (4) of this section who are called or ordered to active duty without their consent shall not be entitled to receive the pay provided by this subsection for any period prior to September 9, 1950."

Sec. 2. Section 2 of the act of September 9, 1950 (64 Stat. 828, ch. 939), is hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. Section 1 of this act shall be effective as of October 1, 1949. Appropriations currently available for pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services shall be available for retroactive payments authorized under this act.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to extend the application of the special-inducement pay provided thereby to physicians and dentists, and for other purposes."

CONTINUANCE OF CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AID ROAD ACT, 1916

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1526, Senate bill 2437.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2437) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 2, line 14, after "(58 Stat. 838)", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may be transferred from the Federal-aid highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid highway system when such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public interest by the State highway department and is approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads."

On page 3, after line 11, to insert:

SEC. 2. For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of Federal-aid primary funds: *Provided*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be determined in the same manner as now provided by law for projects on said Federal-aid primary system.

On page 4, line 4, to change the section number from "2" to "3"; in line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "\$32,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000"; in line 11, after the word "of", to strike out "\$28,000,000" and insert "\$22,500,000"; in line 18, to change the section number from "3" to "4"; in line 19, after the word "improvement", to strike out the comma and "and maintenance."

On page 5, line 1, after the word "of", to strike out "\$16,000,000" and insert "\$10,000,000"; in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "\$17,000,000" and insert "\$10,000,000"; in line 24, to change the section number from "4" to "5"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "Section" and insert "for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section."

On page 6, line 4, after "(55 Stat. 860)", to strike out "is hereby amended to read as follows:" and insert "as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785)"; in line 7, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "There" and insert "there"; in line 16, after the word "and" where it occurs the second time, to insert "completion of"; in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "one-third"; at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "The expenditures authorized by this section shall be made in accordance with all provisions and limitations in section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950."

On page 7, line 3, to change the section number from from "5" to "6"; in line 21, after the word "width", to insert "where practicable."

On page 8, line 13, after "December", to strike out "14" and insert "15"; in line 14, after the word "parties", to insert "or any other treaty or international convention establishing similar reciprocal recognition"; in line 23, after the name "Rama", to insert "and for a survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff."

On page 9, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 6. Not to exceed \$15,000,000 of any money heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with the provision of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, shall be available for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads in accordance with the pro-

vision of section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785) as an emergency relief fund.

After line 11, to insert:

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of \$15,000,000 for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, after receipt of an application therefor from the highway department of any State, in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid highway systems, which he shall find have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, landslides, or other catastrophes in any part of the United States. The appropriation of such moneys as may be necessary for the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That, pending the appropriation of said sum, or its replenishment, the Commissioner of Public Roads may expend, from existing Federal-aid highway appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That no expenditures shall be made hereunder with respect to any such catastrophe in any State unless an emergency has been declared by the Governor of such State and concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce: *And provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made available under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof.

On page 10, line 15, to change the section number from "7" to "8"; in line 21, after the word "of", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$2,500,000"; in line 24 to change the section number from "8" to "9."

On page 11, after line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 9. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$150,000,000 to remain available until expended.

After line 11, to insert:

SEC. 10. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$50,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That whenever any project for the construction or improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, as being important for civilian or military defense, such project may be constructed under the authorization in this section and in accordance with the conditions contained therein.

At the top of page 12, to insert:

SEC. 11. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

In line 7, to change the section number from "10" to "12"; in line 13, to change the section number from "11" to "13"; and in line 16, to change the section number from "12" to "14", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$600,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) \$270,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system.

(b) \$180,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

(c) \$150,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid highway system in urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for 18 months after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this act.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of Federal-aid primary funds: *Provided*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be determined in the same manner as now provided by law for projects on said Federal-aid primary system.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in na-

tional parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of parkways, authorized by acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervisions of the Commissioner of Public Roads.

SEC. 5. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway," approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for each fiscal year thereafter up to and including the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and completion of construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear.

SEC. 6. Recognizing the mutual benefits that will accrue to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States from the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in said Republic of Nicaragua, the construction of which road was begun and partially completed pursuant to an agreement between said Republic and the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$8,000,000 for completing the construction of such road, to be available until expended. No expenditure shall be made hereunder for the construction of said road until a request therefor shall have been received by the Secretary of State from the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua nor until an agreement shall have been entered into by said Republic with the Secretary of State which shall provide, in part, that said Republic—

(1) will provide, without participation of funds herein authorized, all necessary right-

of-way for the construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall be of a minimum width where practicable of 100 meters in rural areas and 50 meters in municipalities and shall forever be held inviolate as a part of the highway for public use;

(2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit any such toll to be charged, for the use of said highway by vehicles or persons;

(3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly, any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of said road by vehicles or persons from the United States that does not apply equally to vehicles or persons of such Republic;

(4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance with the provision of the Convention for the Regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington on December 15, 1943, and to which such Republic and the United States are parties or any other treaty or international convention establishing similar reciprocal recognition; and

(5) will maintain said road after its completion in proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.

(b) The funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the terms of this act for the survey and construction of the said road from San Benito to Rama, and for a survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff in the Republic of Nicaragua without being matched by said Republic, and all expenditures made under the provisions of this act for materials, equipment, and supplies, shall, whenever practicable, be made for products of the United States or of the Republic of Nicaragua.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of \$15,000,000 for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, after receipt of an application therefor from the highway department of any State, in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid highway systems, which he shall find have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, landslides, or other catastrophes in any part of the United States. The appropriation of such moneys as may be necessary for the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That, pending the appropriation of said sum, or its replenishment, the Commissioner of Public Roads may expend, from existing Federal-aid highway appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That no expenditures shall be made hereunder with respect to any such catastrophe in any State unless an emergency has been declared by the Governor of such State and concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce: *And provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made available under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof.

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, non-taxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, to remain available until expended.

Sec. 9. The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized and directed to assist in carrying out the action program of the President's Highway Safety Conference and to cooperate with the State highway departments and other agencies in this program to advance the cause of safety on the streets and highways: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$100,000 shall be expended annually for the purposes of this section.

Sec. 10. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$50,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That whenever any project for the construction or improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, as being important for civilian or military defense, such project may be constructed under the authorization in this section and in accordance with the conditions contained therein.

Sec. 11. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 833); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, as approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

Sec. 12. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Sec. 13. That all acts or parts of acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed, and this act shall take effect on its passage.

Sec. 14. This act may be cited as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not know how much progress we can make this evening. I appreciate the fact that Senators have remained in the Chamber. I did not give notice of a night session tonight. The Senate will meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. We have two bills to pass, the pending bill and the independent offices appropriation bill, so, unless we can complete consideration of those two bills before evening, we shall have a night session. We are going to make more progress than we have made today. We have spent altogether too much time waiting for quorum calls.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say the Senate will meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; the Senate will meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we have wasted so much time during the afternoon that perhaps some people would find it difficult to appreciate what we are doing. I would ask Senators who

are in the Chamber, kindly Senators and serious Senators, who want to enact constructive legislation, to remember that the Committee on Public Works of the Senate is not a political committee. We deal with constructive work.

We are now considering Senate bill 2437. All I am asking of Senators is to be patient for a few minutes at least, and that instead of discussing who is going to be President next year, or this, that, or the other subject, we do something for the United States.

The bill I am presenting provides for what? It provides for continuing into a fiscal years 1954 and 1955 the policy of Federal aid in the construction and improvement of the Nation's highways. Is that important? I ask every Senator on both sides of the aisle whether it is important. This is continuing legislation. It is not new legislation. It is not new legislation in the sense of establishing new programs or commitments of new policy. It merely continues the policy and programs of Federal aid to highway improvements which were first adopted by Congress—when? In 1916—and which have been continued in force ever since.

The bill provides the necessary authorizations for another 2-year period to maintain the guiding hand of Federal aid, which has estimated development of the greatest system in the world.

There can be no question about the need for highway development. The principal question involved is how much or how little money we shall invest in the program. It is a question of whether we provide only enough to maintain our existing roads or whether we provide enough to improve and extend the roads. We find very few people who are willing to let our highways deteriorate.

The records show that we have done very little to improve our highways during the past 10 years. During World War II we stopped all highway construction except defense roads, and since the end of the war we have not yet been able to make up entirely for the battering which the wartime traffic gave our highways.

In other words, this is what happened: All our highways, whether they be in Massachusetts, Michigan, Kansas, Washington, or elsewhere, were designed to take care of 2-ton trucks. Today the trucks are much larger and the roads are still feeling the effects of the wartime traffic. I want Senators to please believe that our committee does not give a continental about what anyone's politics are. We are trying to do constructive work for roads. We may have come to wrong conclusions about dollars and cents, but we know that we need roads, whether they cost 50 cents or 60 cents.

As I have said, the records show that we have done very little to improve our highways during the past 10 years, and during World War II we stopped all highway construction except defense roads. Since the end of the war we have not yet been able to entirely make up

for the battering which the wartime traffic gave our highways. Yet in the past 10-year period the traffic on the highways has increased from 34,000,000 vehicles to 52,000,000 vehicles in 1952. In other words, there has been an increase of 18,000,000 vehicles during the past 10 year period. There are now 52,000,000 vehicles on our roads. Is the bill important? Is it as important as whether dentists shall get \$100 a month more in pay? I am asking, in all seriousness and without any idea of politics of the Senators who are so kind as to be present, to do something for Uncle Sam and for Uncle Sam's people. I repeat, in the past 10 years the traffic on the highways has increased from 34,000,000 vehicles to 52,000,000 vehicles. The number of miles traveled on the highways per year now amounts to 600,000,000,000 miles, or approximately double the miles of highway travel 10 years ago. Today there is an average of one car for every three people in the Nation. Every source of factual research—and I am referring to factual research, without inquiring into anyone's politics or whether he was elected by a particular political party—shows that our highway system is not meeting the expansion of highway traffic, and the people who drive the cars and trucks today know it only too well. That is true whether a person drives a car from Arlington, Va., to Washington, or from Washington, D. C., to St. Louis, or between any other two places.

Our highway engineers tell us that we are not even keeping up with obsolescence. The roads are wearing out faster than we can rebuild or replace them.

Senators may think that Europe is important; or they may think that Asia is important. Let me say that only the thing that keeps the United States together is our roads; it is transportation. The constitution uses the expression "United States of America." Do Senators know what united the United States? It was transportation, believe it or not. That is what did it. In the olden days after the Civil War southerners were cursing the Yankees in the North. Yankees were cursing the rebels in the South. Both of them were cursing the wild and woolly westerners. Do Senators know what united the United States? It was the 1916 law. That law made transportation possible. That is all that this bill is trying to do now.

Highway engineers tell us that it would take about \$32,000,000,000 to bring the Federal-aid systems up to first-class condition. If we spread the amount over as long a period as 10 years, it would mean that we should double the present annual amount of Federal aid, and bring it up to \$1,000,000,000 a year. If we needed to be concerned only with our domestic affairs, that is the amount of highway aid we should be providing today, because it would repay generous dividends. But unfortunately, whether we like it or not, we must face the fact that international uncertainties have forced heavy defense expenditures upon us. So, in highway aid, as in so many

other things, we cannot do as much as we should do.

The pending bill, therefore, does little more than give assurance that our highways will not suffer greatly from deterioration in the next 2 years. In comparison with the present authorization, the bill authorizes barely enough to cover the increase in price levels during the past 2 years. This bill is admittedly a stopgap measure, recommended in the hope that 2 years hence conditions will be such that in this field we can provide for the aid needed to get off dead center and begin to move forward.

The committee report on Senate bill 2437 contains an explanation of the bill in detail.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wonder whether the Senator from New Mexico would be willing to have proposed at this time a unanimous-consent agreement providing for a limitation of debate on the bill, to begin at 10 o'clock in the morning?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would not mind a limitation on debate; but there are few times when we can get many Senators here on bills such as this one; but a number of Senators would probably be here if the Senate were considering a bill relating to Indonesia or a bill relating to China or a bill relating to France or a bill relating to Italy, or a similar bill. I wish Senators would pay a little attention to what affects the United States of America.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand the Senator's point. However, if the Senator from New Mexico does not object, I should like to attempt to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement for a limitation of debate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that my friend, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Ferguson], would love to continue to listen to my remarks.

Mr. McFARLAND. I realize that, but I wondered whether the Senator from New Mexico would be willing to let me propose a unanimous consent agreement at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I prefer to continue with my remarks at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know that Senators believe it is important to consider the decision just reached by the Supreme Court, and it is important. But, Mr. President, believe me, getting the farmer out of the mud is also important. So I wish to discuss this bill. I hope my good friend, the economist from Michigan, will follow me in these remarks.

This bill will do what has been done since 1916, so far as roads and road bills are concerned. Since 1916, Congress has been passing authorization bills in behalf of the American people—not in behalf of the Republican Party or in behalf of the Democratic Party, but in behalf of the American people. I think that is a fine idea. My good friend, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Cain], is the

ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Roads. I ask him now whether at any time any effort has been made to play politics with this bill or with anything having to do with public roads for the American people. Roads affect all of us, just as floods do. A flood in Republican Kansas may do as much harm as one in Democratic Mississippi.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Is not Kansas going Democratic in the next election?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall not get into politics now. I am trying to have the Senate pass a constructive bill in the interest of the American people, namely, the road bill, the one bill which has for its purpose its getting the farmer out of the mud.

Mr. President, the farmers need roads. The farmers do not care under what political auspices the road bills are presented in Congress; the farmers simply wish to have the road bills passed and the roads constructed. The roads are for the use of all, for the use of Republicans, for the use of Democrats. Once a road is built, it is available to everyone; it makes no difference what may be the political faith of the driver of an automobile or truck that rolls down the road.

Two years ago, in 1950, the road authorization bill called for \$500,000,000 for the primary, secondary, and urban system. This time the committee, in the best faith, in an attempt to save money, but at the same time in an attempt to maintain the American way of life, recommends an authorization of \$600,000,000. That was recommended, not because the committee wished to have \$100,000,000 more made available to those who build the roads, but because—regardless of whether we like it or not—\$100,000,000 more is needed to do today what we could have done 2 or 3 years ago with \$500,000,000. That is the explanation of the situation. So the committee recommends \$600,000,000 for the primary, secondary, and urban system.

All of us know what the urban system is. In Illinois it is United States Route 66; in my State it is United States Route 85; in Maryland it is United States Route No. 1, and so forth.

This bill also relates to secondary roads and to the farm-to-market roads. Is any Member of the Senate opposed to the building of such roads? If so, let him rise now and say so.

Mr. President, I say God bless the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden]. When it comes to roads, as well as other subjects, he thinks—and he thinks correctly—not as a Democrat from Arizona, but as an American citizen who is trying to help every State in the Union. The urban system has to do with places such as Baltimore, Washington, Chicago, Detroit; the urban system relates to them more than it does to the Western States, from which come most of the members of the committee.

Then we come to the interstate highway system. The roads in that system

are related to the national defense; they are the roads which will connect Baltimore with San Francisco.

Then we come to the forest highways. Let me say that I am sorry that at this time so few Senators are in the Chamber. Neither the American people as a whole nor the Senate itself realize at this moment the tremendous assets we have in the State of my good friend, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Cain]. Many of those assets belong to the American people. In the State of the Senator from Washington, 150,000 board-feet of lumber can be obtained from 1 acre of land. The people are not aware of those assets and their importance. We are trying to provide for forest highways which will connect the interstate highways with the national system of roads through the forests.

Then we come to the forest access roads. They make available millions and millions of acres of the finest timberland which belongs to the American people. Is it necessary that highways be built so that timber can be reached?

Mr. President, this bill is not brought forward in self-interest; this bill actually relates to economics.

Then there are the roads in the national parks and parkways and the Indian reservation roads. Many of us are constantly worried about the Indians, and we sympathize very greatly with them. Mr. President, my colleagues should not merely feel sorry for the Indians; my colleagues should let the Indians help themselves. What the Indians need are roads to enable them to have contacts with others. After all, this bill calls for only a small sum—\$10,000,000—for that purpose. As a matter of fact, the Indians have been robbed of more than that amount.

Then there are the roads through the public lands. As is known by my friend, the Senator from Washington, who is ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Roads, in the West we have many public lands. In my State, 63 percent of the area belongs to the Federal Government. Thirty-seven percent of my State pays for the cost of the State government. In Arizona the proportion is about the same. In Nevada approximately 88 percent of the land belongs to the Federal Government.

So this bill calls for a little—but only a very little—to take care of the road system for the public lands. For instance, the bill calls for \$600,000,000—\$100,000,000 more than was called for 2 years ago, for the reason that today \$600,000,000 is needed to do what could have been done for \$500,000,000 2 years ago.

For the interstate highway system we are asking for \$50,000,000.

For the forest highway system we are asking for \$25,000,000.

For the forest access roads we are asking for \$22,500,000.

For the national parks roads we are asking for \$10,000,000.

For the parkways roads we are asking for \$10,000,000.

For the Indian reservation roads we are asking for \$10,000,000.

For the public lands roads we are asking for \$2,500,000.

That has been reduced from \$5,000,000.

We then have a lump-sum appropriation. Indeed, many people might object to that; but we are still in the society of nations, we are still in the United States of America.

Mr. President, there are many things I do not like. I might object strenuously to the appropriation of billions of dollars to be sent to Europe or Asia, but I nevertheless love my country, and I want to go along with what is best for my country. They are commitments which are logically and honestly brought about, and I want to see that my country continues them.

We need further development of strategic defense roads and a uniform development of interstate routes vital to defense; there can be no question about that. We also know that highway usage is far ahead of highway improvement. When we commence to lay out additional roads, are we still talking about 2-ton trucks. Are there not 30- and 40-ton trucks today?

We ask for an inter-American highway. Mr. President, were it not for the possible and probable beneficial results to our own country, I would not vote to appropriate one penny to any foreign country. The money we are now spending on roads in Latin America is money contributed with a view to enabling them to buy more from us. When those highways are completed, what automobiles will roll over them? They will be automobiles from Detroit, Cleveland, and Chicago. Where will the people of Latin America buy their machinery? They will buy it in Chicago, Cleveland, and Toledo. That is the reason. Apart from the element of good will, it is not altogether a one-way matter.

I do not want to make myself believe that I am optimistic about Europe or Asia, because I am not. The people of those countries have been plowing their poor land for about 2,000 years. We love the American way of life. There is but one way to keep that way of life, and that is through the creation of wealth. In this country we have but one way by which to create that way of life. Hudson Bay and Patagonia and such places have not been developed. With American skill plus the endeavors of people south of the American border, the Latin-American countries could produce 10 times the amount of wealth they are now producing. When they did so, where would they buy? They would buy from Uncle Sam. For that reason, I think the State Department was correct in recommending the inter-American highway. That is the economic aspect of it. I am interested in that, deeply interested. But, besides that, during World War II, the Germans were powerful enough to go into the Caribbean. Some people, possibly, do not know where the Caribbean is. Drake and Morgan knew about it. Knowledge of it on the part of the world started about 400 years ago. They knew about America. They knew about other places.

So while this bill possibly does not represent the best of judgment, nevertheless I may say it represents the considered judgment of a nonpartisan committee. I ask my good friend from the State of Washington whether it is not true that it comes from a nonpartisan committee.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. CAIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield first to the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from Washington is about to suggest the absence of a quorum, if we are to vote on amendments. I do not believe we could obtain a quorum at this time and expect Senators to remain during the consideration of this bill tonight.

I ask unanimous consent that, beginning tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, there be a limitation of 40 minutes on each amendment, 20 minutes to the side, and 1 hour on the bill, the time upon the amendments to be controlled, respectively, by the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, unless the latter should happen to favor the amendment, in which case the time would be controlled by the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I like my good friend from Arizona, but I should like to say to him that I think this bill is so good for the American people. There has not been before the Senate a bill which would do more for the American people than the road bill. I say that irrespective of headlines in the Washington papers.

Mr. McFARLAND. I certainly agree with the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If my memory serves me correctly, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] introduced the original highway bill. I would not be averse to entering into an agreement, but I ask, why can we not vote upon certain of the amendments now?

Mr. McFARLAND. We could do that, but for the fact that many Senators are absent. Even if the absence of a quorum were suggested, I doubt that we would be able to obtain a quorum at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is suggested that we might not be able to obtain a quorum. But suppose we did. Suppose we trust Senators to do the right thing, for the moment at least.

Mr. McFARLAND. If it is desired to proceed further without a quorum call, and if the distinguished acting minority leader does not intend to suggest the absence of a quorum, I am willing to proceed. But I do not want to have the Senate put in an embarrassing position.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to have an expression of opinion from the acting minority leader, since he is also the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to say to the majority leader that it is my view, with reference to this side of the aisle, that it would not be possible

to obtain a quorum at this late hour. Nor do I believe that action ought to be taken on any of the important amendments which are to be considered, without a quorum being present.

I share completely the view advanced by the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee, that the bill he has discussed is of real importance to the entire Nation, and that a majority of Senators on both sides of the aisle ought to be present and taking an interest when action is called for on any amendment to be presented, or upon the bill itself.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then, under those circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, there be a limitation of debate of 40 minutes on each amendment, as well as on motions and appeals, the time to be equally divided, and to be controlled, respectively, by the proponents of the amendment, and, by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico; that all amendments must be germane, and that the general debate on the passage of the bill be limited to 1 hour, the time to be controlled respectively by the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico and the minority leader, or by any Senator whom he may designate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I would love to agree with the majority leader, but I do not believe in limitations on debate. This bill is in my opinion, so important to the American people that I am willing to let the Senate discuss it as much as may be desired. I think it is most important. No doubt there will be limitations on debate in connection with the consideration of some bill which proposes to appropriate \$8,000,000,000 for use elsewhere.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, if the Senator does not want to agree—

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not consent.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from New Mexico desires to object, does he?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

Mr. McFARLAND. I regret that very much, Mr. President, because it may mean that this bill will not be finished tomorrow.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator is more willing to help Tunisia and Africa than to help the United States of America, it is all right with me.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, that is a very unfair statement and is unjustified by the record.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall send to the desk in a moment an amendment to the bill, S. 2437, which is under consideration. My amendment would reduce the total authorization by \$200,000,000 each year. It would do so by reducing the authorization for the Federal-aid road system from \$600,000,000 to \$400,000,000. The reduction would be distributed in somewhat larger proportionate cuts among secondary roads and urban roads than in the primary highway systems.

Of course, the system of public roads is extremely important, but we also need

to remember that they are subordinate to our preparedness program.

As students of the bill know, the original recommendation of the Budget Bureau for the Federal-aid road system was for an authorization for those items of \$400,000,000 a year for 2 years. The House of Representatives increased the figure to \$550,000,000. The Senate committee then increased the sum to \$600,000,000 a year, and also added two other \$50,000,000 appropriations, one for interstate highways and the other for circumferential highways. In fact, therefore the total committee increase over the administration's request has been at least \$300,000,000.

We very frequently criticize, and I think, properly, the governmental agencies for sending excessive figures in requests for appropriations and authorizations, which are not covered by the tax bills which are likely to be passed. Here is a case where the House of Representatives and the Senate Public Works Committee, I am sure, with the best of motives, have greatly increased the figure above that requested by the administration. In my judgment, in view of the financial situation with which we are faced, we should go back to the Budget estimate on this item and save \$200,000,000 a year.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be separately printed and lie on the table.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. **CAIN.** Mr. President, I should like to express my appreciation and admiration for the character and substance of the presentation which has just been offered to the Senate by the chairman of the Public Works Committee, the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. When he advises the

Senate, which is to say, when he advises the Nation, that his intention is to help the United States of America, he is speaking, from my own knowledge, nothing but a complete truth. The Senator from New Mexico has on several occasions this afternoon made reference to the junior Senator from Washington and inquired if it were not a fact that there are few political considerations within the Committee on Public Works. I always enjoy agreeing with my colleague from New Mexico, when that is possible, and it very often is possible.

The only function of the Public Works Committee, as I understand, is to render political free service, the most splendid service, to all the States of the Union, regardless of politics which may exist within those States or within the Nation as a whole.

I relish this opportunity to express my deep regard for the intentions which always underlie the work of a very sincere and honest American—the senior Senator from New Mexico.

RECESS TO 10 A. M. TOMORROW

Mr. **McFARLAND.** I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 3, 1952, at 10 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 2, 1952:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be generals

Lt. Gen. Lauris Norstad, 25A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commander in chief, United States Air Forces in Europe, with rank of general.

Lt. Gen. Otto Paul Weyland, 63A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, to be commanding general, Far East Air Forces, with rank of general.

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Charles Pearre Cabell, 70A, Regular Air Force, to be director, the joint staff, Joint Chiefs of Staff, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Laurence Carbee Craigie, 61A, Regular Air Force, to be deputy chief of staff, development, United States Air Force, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Leon William Johnson, 88A, Regular Air Force, to be commanding general, Continental Air Command, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Charles Trovella Myers, 37A, Regular Air Force, to be commander in chief, United States Northeast Command, with rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Smith, 84A, Regular Air Force, to be commander, Military Air Transport Service, with rank of lieutenant general.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 2, 1952:

REGULAR AIR FORCE

Midshipman Michel Daniel Charneski, United States Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 3, 1952, upon his graduation, under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947). Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman Paul S. MacLafferty (Naval Academy) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps in the Navy, subject to physical qualification and approval by the Secretary of the Navy.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 4, 1952
For actions of June 3, 1952
62nd-2nd, No. 95

CONTENTS

Appropriations.....	2,6	Forestry.....	1,6	Personnel.....	6,16
Buildings.....	6	Immigration.....	9	Price support.....	8,15
Cotton.....	8,15	Import control.....	3	Reclamation.....	10
Dairy industry.....	13	Inflation.....	14	Reconstruction Fi-	
Defense production.....	17	Information.....	6	nance Corporation.....	5
Education.....	20	Investigations.....	6	Road authorizations.....	1
Emergency powers.....	18	Lands, public.....	12	Roads.....	3,6
Flood relief.....	21	Leave.....	2	St. Lawrence Seaway.....	4
Foreign aid.....	7	Military training.....	19	Transportation.....	11

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed road authorizations bill. Senate passed independent offices appropriation bill. House received conference report on third supplemental appropriation bill. Conferees agreed on foreign-aid bill. House debated cotton parity standards bill. Sen. Young urged import control on grains.

SENATE

1. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. Passed with amendments H. R. 7340, authorizing appropriations for road construction in 1954 and 1955 (pp. 6505-21, 6527-31; 6536-43). Agreed, 54-14, to a Douglas amendment decreasing the highway authorizations by a total of \$100,000,000, after earlier rejecting a Douglas amendment to make a greater cut (pp. 6527-9). Agreed to a Cain amendment to require advisory public hearings before construction of timber access roads (p. 6529). Sens. Chavez, Holland, Kerr, Cain, and Case were appointed as Senate conferees. No changes were made in the amounts for forest highways or forest roads and trails.
2. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 7072 (pp. 6543-4, 6547-86). Sens. Maybank, O'Mahoney, McKellar, Hill, McElhannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, and Ferguson were appointed Senate conferees. Sen. Johnston inserted his statement commending the Senate committee for striking out the Thomas leave rider, and criticizing the rider (pp. 6565-6).
3. IMPORT CONTROL. Sen. Young recommended import controls on oats, barley, rye, and feed wheat in addition to the commodities already covered by Sec. 104 of the Defense Production Act (pp. 6531-6).
4. ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY. Sen. Wiley inserted various statements favoring this proposed project (pp. 6522-3).
5. RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION. As reported (see Digest 93), S. 515 increases from \$40,000,000 to \$100,000,000 the amount of disaster-relief loans which RFC may make, and also contains various provisions regarding the internal management of RFC.

HOUSE

6. THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 6947 (pp. 6597-9).

Actions by conferees:

Fixed the item for fighting forest fires at \$3,250,000 instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.
Made various reductions in specific appropriation items for pay costs, including several for this Department, instead of applying a straight percentage cut as previously proposed.

Items reported in disagreement:

- Provision that the \$700,000 for smoke jumper facilities "shall be the full cost of the acquisition of land and construction of facilities."
- Provision for pay increases of \$800 for officials whose salaries are specified in the Executive Pay Act at \$14,000.
- Various amounts for claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments.
- Revolving fund of \$6,500,000 for Civil Service Commission investigations, to be reimbursed by the departments and agencies.

Other items in the bill which were not subject to conference action:

Modification of the Whitten personnel rider. Regarding this item the House conferees included the following comments in their statement: "It is the understanding of the conferees that the existing language of the Whitten amendment provides authority for the Civil Service Commission to authorize permanent appointments in the Post Office Department up to the number of permanent employees on the rolls as of September 1, 1950."
Prohibition against use of appropriations in this bill for "publicity or propaganda purposes not heretofore authorized by the Congress."
Federal-aid highways, \$69,500,000 additional.
Supply and records center, Kansas City, \$4,400,000.

7. FOREIGN AID. Conferees on H. R. 7005, to extend the Mutual Security Program for fiscal year 1953, agreed to file (but did not actually file) a conference report authorizing an appropriation of \$6,147,730,750, as contrasted with \$6,765,861,500 as approved by the Senate, and \$6,219,600,000 as approved by the House (p. D535).
8. COTTON PARITY. Began debate on H. R. 5713, providing Low Middling seven-eighths cotton as the standard grade for determining parity and price support for the 1952 cotton crop (pp. 6596-7).
9. IMMIGRATION. The Judiciary Committee concluded hearings on H. R. 7376, authorizing the issuance of 300,000 special nonquota immigration visas to certain refugees (p. D534).

BILL INTRODUCED

10. RECLAMATION. S. 3271, by Sen. O'Mahoney (for himself, Sen. Hunt, and Sen. Case), to provide that certain costs and expenses incurred in connection with repayment contracts with the Deaver, Wildwood, and Belle Fourche irrigation districts shall be nonreimbursable; to Interior and Insular Affairs Committee (p. 6524).

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

11. TRANSPORTATION. Speech in the House by Rep. Rankin favoring recent action of the Interstate Commerce Commission confirming by unanimous vote its recent order to eliminate, effective May 30, 1952, the one-way freight rate which has been in



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 98

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 3, 1952

No. 95

Senate

(Legislative day of Monday, June 2, 1952)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of justice and righteousness, we would constantly search our own hearts, even as we mobilize our national might to keep pagan powers of darkness from strangling our liberties and from accomplishing their evil design of enslaving the whole world. Fervently we pray that we may see clearly that this godless growth of tyranny with its false promises feeds upon hunger and misery and exploitation. Give us to understand that its ominous spread has been made possible partly by the low spiritual vitality of democracy, by the relaxing of loyalty to the Christian principles and verities on which freedom's very breath depends. With the anxious world listening as we here talk about defense and plan for more and more arms to stay aggression, help us never to be unmindful—lest we forget that the real and ultimate battle must be fought deep in the hearts of men, where burn the fires of faith. Facing boldly the causes of seething discontent of moral decay and mental confusion, may we march into the new world that is to be to fulfill the fair promises to humanity which slave systems make but to break. So may we keep the faith. We ask it in the name of that One who is the truth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 2, 1952, was dispensed with.

CONTINUANCE OF CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT, 1916

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, Senate bill 2437.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2437) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act ap-

proved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, when the session was concluded yesterday, I was giving to the Senate information about S. 2437, which now appears in the RECORD yesterday. I only wish to add that the road bill which was reported to the Senate was certainly given all necessary consideration by the Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Roads. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] is chairman of the subcommittee. He spent many long days listening to testimony about the need for continuing this laudable program.

Mr. President, I know the Senate is well acquainted with the history of road building in this country, and the need for road construction. The committee has not done anything except to recommend continuation of a program which was started in 1916.

The only difference between the bill of 1950 and the one of 1952 is in the amount recommended for the primary system. The bill which was passed 2 years ago authorized an appropriation of \$500,000,000. The pending bill authorizes an appropriation of \$600,000,000 for primary, secondary, and urban systems. The primary system is the transcontinental, or interstate, system.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New Mexico stated the Federal-aid road system was started in 1916. The other day I happened to be looking at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of those days and found that I introduced a Federal-aid road bill in the House of Representatives on November 26, 1911, 4 days after I was sworn in as a Member of the House. As I recall, Mr. Shackelford, of Kansas, was chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the House at that time. A number of Federal-aid road bills had been introduced, and later

we finally agreed on a bill which became known as the Shackelford bill. However, it was a composite of the principal features of all the bills which had been introduced, and it took Mr. Shackelford's name because he was chairman of the committee.

There was a tremendous fight in getting the bill through in both the House and the Senate, it being strongly argued by many that it was unconstitutional.

After the bill had passed both Houses, and had gone to President Wilson, we learned that he was thinking of vetoing it on the ground that it was unconstitutional. Senator John H. Bankhead, Sr., and I went to see the President about it, and got him to change his mind because the contemplated roads could be used to promote the national defense.

The Senator from New Mexico is correct in saying that we did not get the system started until 1916. It did not actually go into effect until sometime in the 1920's, after the conclusion of the First World War. Since then we have built up one of the grandest systems of roads on earth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that the people of the country will ever be grateful to him and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who were the originators of and actually pioneered the way for a road system in this country.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What we are trying to do now, as successors to those good gentlemen, is to carry on the same program without any changes whatsoever. But, as the Senator well knows, it costs more to build a road now than it did in 1916.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is entirely correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the only reason why the committee is recommending \$600,000,000 instead of \$500,000,000.

For forest highways, we are recommending \$25,000,000. The original recommendation for forest highways in S. 2437 was \$32,000,000. The House companion bill to the Senate bill recom-

6505

FILE COPY

CHIEF, LEGISLATIVE REPORTING
Office of Budget and Finance

mended \$22,000,000. The Senate committee is recommending a reduction from \$32,000,000 to \$25,000,000.

With reference to forest roads and trails, I feel certain the Senate will agree with me as to the importance of properly protecting our forest properties. I do not know whether the American people realize the vast resources which they have in their forest reserves and their value. I believe that one of the greatest contributions made by any President of the United States was made by President Theodore Roosevelt when he decided that the forest reserves should be protected, and appointed the late Governor Pinchot, of Pennsylvania, as the first forester.

There are many millions of acres of virgin timber land. How is that property affected by the provisions of the pending bill? Forest highways and forest access roads are provided for. Several years ago I visited a number of forests in the State of California. As far as the eye could reach there was a field of green, formed by the most beautiful trees man ever gazed upon.

Forest trails are provided for in the bill, so that in case of fire or in case it is desired to harvest some of the timber, there will be access roads into the virgin timber. That policy is in keeping with what we have done heretofore. Formerly the Agriculture Department constructed such roads and had jurisdiction over them. The same principle applies to the Indian reservation roads and the parkway roads. However, several years ago Congress decided that the road builder should be the Bureau of Public Roads. Notwithstanding the fact that construction funds are authorized in various bills, the construction and supervision of such roads are carried on by the Bureau of Public Roads. The bill as a whole is in keeping with present demands for roads.

Imagine what would have happened in the First World War and in the Second World War if we had not kept transportation rolling all over the country. Roads are just as necessary to the national defense as are guns. Guns and supplies must be transported across the land. One of the things that have saved this country is the fact that many years ago Congress decided that the United States should have a road system.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico one or two questions about the bill. As I read the bill, I note that no provision is made for access highways, which are very important to the present military defense program. Many of our States have incurred special obligations because of new highways which are necessary around large cities, around cantonments, and around air bases. I wonder if the Senator can advise the Senate as to what suggestions might be in order in connection with that type of approach. What can we expect?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will turn to page 11 of the bill, he will note that section 10 reads as follows:

SEC. 10. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$50,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That whenever any project for the construction or improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, as being important for civilian or military defense, such project may be constructed under the authorization in this section and in accordance with the conditions contained therein.

Let me say to the Senator from Kansas that the proviso in that section was inserted at the request and suggestion of the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is a member of the subcommittee. It provides for two things. The proviso takes care of the circumferential or radial roads. The authorization of \$50,000,000 is to take care of the access roads. We decided that possibly \$50,000,000 was not sufficient. Originally I thought \$150,000,000 should have been provided. The reason I thought so was that when the previous highway bill was pending, the committee recommended \$25,000,000. On the day the bill was considered by the Senate, in the old Supreme Court Chamber, a letter came to the chairman of the committee suggesting that the amount be reduced to \$10,000,000.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Let me ask whether the fund of \$50,000,000 is to be matched by the States, or whether it is a fund which can be used directly by the Department of Defense, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads, for access highways.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Under the authorization it can be used up to 100 percent without matching, but, of course, any matching is available to add to the total provided by the Federal Government.

Mr. CARLSON. As the chairman of the committee well knows, there is a great need for assistance to some States in areas where there has been a large increase of traffic on highways which were constructed to carry normal traffic.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is why I thought, and as a matter of fact the committee thought, that probably \$50,000,000 might not be sufficient, but, in deference to the suggestion made by some members of the committee, we reported \$50,000,000. The proviso applying to these funds came as I have said, as a suggestion from the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I suggest to the distinguished chairman of the committee that this is a very important amendment. I think it will be very helpful. As to whether the amount

is sufficient will have to be determined by the program.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished chairman of the committee to section 7, which I understand is a new approach to the authorization of highway funds when it comes to dealing with the construction of highways, and the reconstruction of highways which have been damaged by floods, hurricanes, and other acts of God. May I ask the distinguished chairman if this is new legislation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; it is continuing legislation, except that a revolving fund is created to take care of emergencies such as occurred in the Senator's State last year, and in Nebraska, Iowa, and the Dakotas during this year's floods. As the Senator from Kansas well knows, at Omaha, Council Bluffs, and other cities, some of the interstate roads were completely wiped out. Of necessity something should be done about it. Section 7 would create a revolving fund of \$15,000,000 to take care of emergencies of that nature.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to state to the distinguished chairman, if he will permit me to do so, that this is a very important section. Every year in various States of the Union losses of this type are suffered. It seems to me that a fund should be available for the reconstruction of highways which have been destroyed by floods or hurricanes, or have been damaged by similar causes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what the committee had in mind.

Mr. CARLSON. I note that once the authorization is granted the bill provides, in line 23, page 9:

The appropriation of such moneys as may be necessary for the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized.

Therefore, once the section is approved the authorization continues, and there will be no need for further legislation on this subject.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the understanding of the committee.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to commend the chairman for the fine work he has done in preparing and reporting the highway bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say that the chairman of the subcommittee and every member of the full committee devoted a great deal of time to this important piece of legislation. In my opinion it is in the interest of the welfare of the country.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. With reference to section 7, I note the following language on page 10, lines 11 to 14:

The Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made available under the section shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof.

Does that language contemplate that the States shall match the funds to the extent of the other 50 percent?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the present law. The language in the bill continues the present law.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. In other words, we should not be led to believe that the Federal Government—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would hand out \$50,000,000, for example.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Yes. There is an obligation and a responsibility upon the States to match the Federal funds.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. The Federal Government provides 50 percent, which can be matched if an emergency arises in any area.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). The amendment of the Senator from Illinois will not be in order until the committee amendments have been disposed of.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Public Works was, on page 2, line 14, after "(58 Stat. 838)", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may be transferred from the Federal-aid highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid highway system when such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public interest by the State highway department and is approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads."

THE CASE OF JACOB (JACK) UDELL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on February 28, 1952, I made a statement, as appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 1605 and 1606, regarding the manner in which Jacob (Jack) Udell, address: New York City; Frankfort, Del.; and Miami Beach, Fla., after employing Joseph D. Nunan, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, as one of his attorneys had been successful in having his \$792,094 tax case pigeonholed in the files of the Department of Justice.

Prosecution of Jack Udell's case was dropped after both the Department of Justice and the Treasury Department had decided that for reasons of his bad health, which was described as extreme anxiety, he should not be prosecuted for income-tax invasion.

Significantly this decision was made within a few weeks after the employment of Joseph D. Nunan, November 17, 1948.

Since last February this additional information has been called to my attention.

In late 1948, during the same period in which both the Treasury Department and the Department of Justice were dropping their tax case against Jack Udell for reasons outlined above, another Government agency, the Veter-

ans' Administration, was negotiating a contract with him for the establishment of a veterans' school in Miami, Fla.

This veterans' school was organized, and operations were begun in November under the name of the National Meat and Food Institute. Jack Udell was the president; Lawrence Udell, his son, the vice president; and his wife, Leah, secretary. The school was operated supposedly for the purpose of teaching veterans how to cut up poultry and other meats.

In the 40-month period between November 1948, and March 20, 1952, Jack Udell, through the operations of this school, collected from the Veterans' Administration \$451,559.30. This does not include the amount the Veterans' Administration paid direct to the veterans as students.

In July 1951, certain alleged irregularities in the operations of this so-called veterans school were reported to the Veterans' Administration, and an investigation was authorized.

In September 1951 this investigation was completed. The report submitted called particular attention to the fact that there were erroneous billings made to the Veterans' Administration for instructions supposedly given to veterans who actually were not in attendance at the school.

I quote from that report:

An attendance roll book showing practically 100 percent attendance at the National Meat and Food Institute for the period October 1949 through October 1950 was submitted to the Identification and Detection Division, Inspection-Investigation Service, for examination to determine the authenticity of the entries.

The report revealed some 395 erasures and alterations had been made to show students present. However, more recent attendance records and checks at the school do show a fairly large percentage of absentees being recorded. The contract with the school allows each student to be absent three times per month, which is well known by the students who generally utilize in full the permitted absences.

One veteran stated under oath that he had been absent while employed (thereafter verified by a check of his employer's records) on July 18, 19, 20, 26, 28, 1950, and August 2, 3, 1950. An examination of the attendance roll book submitted to the Identification and Detection Division showed him as being marked present on those dates after alterations and erasures were made therein.

During the investigation the owner, Jacob Udell, refused to discuss with the examining agents the activities of the school and arranged for a meeting at his attorney's office.

At this meeting Attorney Albert S. Dubbin advised his clients, Mr. Jack Udell and Mr. Evilio (Jake) Ramirez, registrar and bookkeeper for the school, to make no statements, nor to answer any questions.

As evidence that the Treasury Department was likewise put on notice regarding this operation, I quote further from the report:

When the auditors reported the school had lost many financial and attendance records necessary to determine cost data for the hourly rate under the contract, the inves-

tigators and auditors contacted and notified the Intelligence Unit of the Miami office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the allegations about which the investigation was being conducted and the facts concerning loss of the records. The agent in charge, Mr. Brown, advised that Mr. Udell had an income-tax suit pending against him.

There is no indication that the Treasury Department paid any attention to this notice. The same lack of concern exists here as was found in his income-tax case.

Many other damaging statements questioning the activities of this school are contained in this report of September 1951 by the Veterans' Administration.

Summarizing Jack Udell's case as discussed last February and again today, we find that:

First. He failed to file any income tax returns in 1945;

Second. The proposed outstanding tax assessments against him, including interest and penalties, total \$792,094;

Third. He was successful in having criminal prosecution in his tax case dropped 6 weeks after Mr. Nunan filed as his attorney; and

Fourth. While still owing three-fourths million dollars in delinquent taxes, he was able to contract with and collect from another Government agency nearly one-half million dollars for operating a veterans' school.

Jack Udell came to this country as an immigrant, and was granted American citizenship.

During the World War II, while American boys were dying fighting for his adopted country, he made substantial profits, yet paid practically no income taxes, even failing to file a return for the year 1945.

The major portion of these large profits were made from farmers in my own area.

Rather than pay taxes, he employed Joseph D. Nunan, former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who today refuses to talk about his activities for "fear of incriminating himself."

Since the war, and while still owing the Federal Government over three-fourths million dollars in back taxes, Jack Udell capitalized on a program which had been set up by Congress for the worthy purpose of assisting veterans in preparing themselves for a postwar trade.

Through padded bookkeeping and other devious methods, he collected from the Government substantial amounts which were charged against this program.

From Mr. Udell's record it appears that he does not appreciate the many advantages of our great country, and apparently is not willing to accept as an adopted American citizen his proportionate part of the responsibility of supporting this Government.

It was not until after the tax case of Mr. Udell had been exposed in the Senate on February 28, 1952, that the Department took any action toward securing an indictment. Even now, as far as I can find out, they have never mentioned this phase of his operations.

CONTINUANCE OF CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT, 1916

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2437) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended, and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I regret that I was not able to be in the Chamber earlier today, during the previous consideration of Senate bill 2437 and during the preliminary remarks on it.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, who is handling this measure, a question about section 10 of the bill.

Section 10 provides, among other things, an authorization for an appropriation of an additional sum of \$50,000,000, "to remain available until expended."

I read from section 10: "for the construction or improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State" if it is "certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, as being important for civilian or military defense."

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether any yardsticks are provided by the bill for the determination of how that amount of money shall be allocated; or is it proposed to leave that question to the determination of the Department of Defense; and does the provision apply at least theoretically, even though the name is not given, to the city of Washington, D. C.?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The city of Washington could participate in the fund if a proper showing were made. It was not intended that the fund should apply only to the city of Washington; the intent was that the fund would be general in its application.

The committee had considerable information concerning the needs for defense in respect to access roads.

If the Senator from Kansas will turn to page 5 of the report—

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Yes; I have it before me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I now read from page 5 of the report:

DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS

The committee studied extensive information concerning authorization needs for defense and access roads. It found considerable variation in the views of different executive agencies on this subject. It considered also two proposed amendments relating to this subject which would provide authorization for circumferential and radial roads generally in the interest of civil defense. One view received from an executive agency was to the effect that this matter could better be considered in separate legislation after further data on the needs of the program are obtained. Other views indicated that additional needs do now exist and various estimates were mentioned, including a size-

able program of timber access roads as well as roads for access to mineral sources, industrial plants, and other defense installations.

When the committee brought up the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 for consideration in the Senate, it was prevailed upon by the executive department to reduce the modest authorization which it had recommended in the bill for defense access roads.

Two years ago the committee recommended to the Senate an authorization of \$25,000,000 for access roads. At the suggestion of the executive department, the authorization was reduced on the floor of the Senate to \$10,000,000. It was only a few months afterward, when the Korean situation developed, that the executive department came to Congress and begged for additional funds for access roads.

In this instance, in the pending bill, the committee, after having considered all those matters, decided that an authorization of \$50,000,000 would be a very modest one to meet what the committee considered to be the needs of the moment.

It is true that in this instance the money, when appropriated, could be used for a circumferential road around Washington, D. C.; or Detroit, Mich.; or Albuquerque, N. Mex.; or Portland, Oreg.; or other cities.

On the other hand, inasmuch as the matter must be handled through the Bureau of Public Roads, we feel confident that there will not be any abuse of the discretion which must be exercised by someone, and we feel confident that the funds will be spent properly. Of course, the main purpose is to provide access roads.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I know the discretion is to be left to the Department of Defense. I also know there is some controversy and some difference of opinion regarding the extent to which these millions and millions of dollars should be spent within the vicinity of the city of Washington, D. C., to the exclusion of some of the cities which have great industrial activities.

According to the bill, apparently the decision is to be left to the Department of Defense, as such.

I should like to know whether the military authorities or the civil defense authorities have indicated where they would likely use the funds if this authorization bill is passed in the amount now proposed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The request must be submitted by a State and must be certified by the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Yes; I know that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We have in mind actual access roads for defense.

I read further from the bill, in regard to the certification: "or such other official as the President may designate."

I believe those provisions of the bill will take care of the problems which appear to be in the mind of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I wish to be sure that the various States will have opportunity, upon reasonable, equitable, honest showing, to use these funds, when need can be shown. I can well en-

vision that not \$50,000,000 but \$100,000,000 or \$150,000,000 might be spent in the area around Washington, D. C. That would be a substantial addition for things other than strictly defense measures or defense activities. I wish to be sure that some safeguards against that are provided.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad the Senator from Kansas has called my attention to this particular matter, because I wish to assure him that the chairman of the committee and, I believe, the committee as a whole wish to make certain that there will be no abuse of the authority granted to any agency of the Federal Government in connection with the distribution and use of the funds authorized by this bill for a particular purpose.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Under section 10, I assume there is no adherence to any formula or pattern for the allocation of any of the \$50,000,000 which would be authorized under that section. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The entire discretionary power would rest, would it not, in the Secretary of Defense or other official, who would determine the priority rights of the various projects for which applications would be submitted?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what they are doing now for actual access roads.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is a diversion from the regular program which is followed in the allocation of highway funds under the matching program, is it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Under the present matching program, all 48 States and the Territories share equitably in the allocation of the Federal funds, do they not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. At this point I should like to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, who is in charge of the pending bill, that it is not always true that allocations of funds made available upon a priority basis are allocated impartially among all the applicants.

I should like to point out that, on page 252 of the hearings on this bill, there appears a statement in regard to atomic energy plant access roads, which reads:

These projects are:

In South Carolina, we have five projects serving our Savannah River plant, at an estimated cost of \$4,511,000.

In the State of Kentucky, there are three road projects serving our Paducah area plant, at an estimated cost of \$746,700.

Is it true that those allocations have been made without any matching of funds by the States in which those projects are located?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I could not answer as to those particular States, but if the Senator will proceed a little further, he will note that, in the States of Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, and Utah, 24 road projects are today serving the raw-materials programs for atomic projects, at an estimated cost of \$3,730,800.

I know that the State of New Mexico, through its highway department, has contributed some money.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am quite sure that other access roads which penetrate raw-materials areas are not essentially the same as those affecting the projects in South Carolina and Kentucky, to which I referred, which provide access to atomic-energy plants. I am particularly interested in knowing whether there has been any State matching of funds in those particular cases.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Having in mind projects such as those in South Carolina, I may say the matching of funds by States generally occurs when the roads serve the general public. If in the instance of South Carolina the project itself does not serve the public as a whole but is only designed for the benefit of the installation in South Carolina, I should not be surprised if the fact were that matching funds could not be obtained.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I presume that that distinction is correct. However, I wanted to point out that in Idaho at the Arco atomic reactor plant considerable difficulty has been encountered in obtaining any assistance in the rebuilding of highways which have been worn out by the use of trucks hauling supplies to the atomic energy plant. Within the past year we have been unable to get any assistance for that particular project, and the State of Idaho was compelled to utilize its regular highway funds to match Federal aid, in order to reconstruct that highway. It was apparent that the highway would not have required rebuilding had it not been for the stress and strain resulting from the use of the highway by atomic energy plant trucks. In this instance, I feel that our State was not treated as equitably as were the States of South Carolina and Kentucky, when they received funds under the priority system for the reconstruction of roads leading to atomic energy installations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As a general rule, very few access roads are built to atomic energy installations with money from this fund. It generally applies to military installations, and in this instance it does, as outlined by the committee. In the West there are many mineral resources. I presume that is true of the State of Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In those States a little extra money was desired in order to reach those mineral areas, in connection with the stockpiling program.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I certainly hope that in giving discretionary power to the Secretary of Defense or to other Federal officials to make allocations on the basis of priority, notice will be served upon those officials that they should not consider in any way the political aspects of those priorities, and that the States, regardless of the political character of the State administrations, will be entitled to equitable treatment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As chairman of the committee, I am sure that I am in full accord with the statement of the Senator from Idaho. The roads are not made for political parties. Roads are made for the benefit of the American people. Roads are needed in Republican Pennsylvania as much as in Democratic Mississippi. We are trying to carry out that idea. I may say to the Senator that I have had little difficulty in the matter of the location of access roads where I thought they were necessary. No question was raised because of the fact that I belonged to the opposite political party.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the chairman of the committee for that statement. I share his views in that respect. But I believe that the Public Works Committee of the Senate, as well as comparable committees in the House of Representatives, should make an effort to require the submission of information and data from the executive agencies which control the allocation of these funds, so that we may know and may have assurance that, while they have no pattern and no specific formula to follow in the allocation of funds, all the States which have atomic energy installations, or which need access roads for the transportation of raw materials or for some other projects, will receive the kind of treatment to which they are entitled.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the Senator from Idaho is correct. I want to assure him that, in my opinion, the one agency of the Federal Government which has the respect of the Congress and of the American people is the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. DWORSHAK. But is it not true that the Bureau of Public Roads does not determine the allocation of these particular funds? I refer to the \$50,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Those funds might be designated by the President, because of the proviso contained in section 10, which reads:

Provided, That whenever any project for the construction or improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate—

We had that in mind, as well as the fact that, when it comes to the question of civilian access roads, the Bureau of Public Roads would control.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have complete confidence in Commissioner MacDonald, of the Bureau of Public Roads, in the matter of the allocation of available highway funds. But in this instance I emphasize that Commissioner MacDonald does not have supervision; that in reality the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, may supersede the officials of the Bureau of Public Roads, and thus may have much greater authority in making the allocations than possibly they should have.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think we can watch any agency of the Federal Government, because I am sure the committee completely agrees with the idea which the Senator from Idaho has in mind regard-

ing proper distribution of the taxpayers' funds for public purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to call up my amendment, identified as "6-2-52—F," and ask that it be read and be made the pending order of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator from Illinois that the Senate has not yet completed action upon the committee amendments. When the committee amendments shall have been acted upon, the Senate will then take up the consideration of individual amendments. The question before the Senate at the present time is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hayden	Millikin
Anderson	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bridges	Hennings	Moody
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Morse
Byrd	Hill	Mundt
Cain	Hoey	Nixon
Capehart	Holland	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Hunt	Pastore
Chavez	Ives	Robertson
Clements	Jenner	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Schoepfel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Seaton
Dirksen	Kerr	Smathers
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Duff	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Lodge	Stennis
Eastland	Long	Taft
Ellender	Martin	Thye
Ferguson	Maybank	Tobey
Flanders	McCarran	Underwood
Fulbright	McCarthy	Welker
George	McClellan	Wiley
Gillette	McFarland	Williams
Green	McKellar	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may we have the amendment stated again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 14, after "(58 Stat. 838)", it is proposed to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided, That not more than 25 percent of the amount apportioned to any State in any year for expenditure on the Federal-aid highway system or on the Federal-aid secondary highway system, respectively, may be transferred from the Federal-aid highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid secondary highway system or from the Federal-aid secondary highway system for expenditure on the Federal-aid highway system when such transfer is requested and certified as being in the public interest by the State highway department and is approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads.*"

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the remaining committee amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 11, it is proposed to insert:

Sec. 2. For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improve-

ment, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838); there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of Federal-aid primary funds: *Provided*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be determined in the same manner as now provided by law for projects on said Federal-aid primary system.

On page 4, line 4, to change the section number from "2" to "3"; in line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "\$32,000,000" and insert "\$25,000,000"; in line 11, after the word "of", to strike out "\$28,000,000" and insert "\$22,500,000"; in line 18, to change the section number from "3" to "4"; in line 19, after the word "improvement", to strike out the comma and "and maintenance."

On page 5, line 1, after the word "of", to strike out "\$16,000,000" and insert "\$10,000,000"; in line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "\$17,000,000" and insert "\$10,000,000"; in line 24, to change the section number from "4" to "5"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "section" and insert "for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section."

On page 6, line 4, after "(55 Stat. 860)", to strike out "is hereby amended to read as follows:" and insert "as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785)"; in line 7, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "There" and insert "there"; in line 16, after the word "and" where it occurs the second time, to insert "completion of"; in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert "one-third"; at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "The expenditures authorized by this section shall be made in accordance with all provisions and limitations in section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950."

On page 7, line 3, to change the section number from "5" to "6"; in line 21, after the word "width", to insert "where practicable."

On page 8, line 13, after "December", to strike out "14" and insert "15"; in line 14, after the word "parties", to insert "or any other treaty or international convention establishing similar reciprocal recognition"; in line 23, after the name "Rama", to insert "and for a survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff."

On page 9, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 6. Not to exceed \$15,000,000 of any money heretofore or hereafter appropriated for expenditure in accordance with the provision of the Federal Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, shall be available for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads in accordance with the provision of section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785) as an emergency relief fund.

After line 11, to insert:

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of \$15,000,000 for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, after receipt of an application therefor from the highway department of any State, in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid highway systems, which he shall find have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, landslides, or other catastrophes in any part of the United States. The appropriation of such moneys as may be necessary for the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That, pending the appropriation of said sum, or its replenishment, the Commissioner of Public Roads may expend, from existing Federal-aid highway appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriations herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That no expenditures shall be made hereunder with respect to any such catastrophe in any State unless an emergency has been declared by the Governor of such State and concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce: *And provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made available under this section shall not exceed 50 percent of the cost thereof.

On page 10, line 15, to change the section number from "7" to "8"; in line 21, after the word "of", to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$2,500,000"; in line 24 to change the section number from "8" to "9."

On page 11, after line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 9. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$150,000,000 to remain available until expended.

After line 11, to insert:

SEC. 10. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$50,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That whenever any project for the construction of improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, as being important for civilian or military defense, such project may be constructed under the authorization in this section and in accordance with the conditions contained therein.

At the top of page 12, to insert:

SEC. 11. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950, not inconsistent with this act, shall remain in full force and effect.

In line 7, to change the section number from "10" to "12"; in line 13, to change

the section number from "11" to "13"; and in line 16, to change the section number from "12" to "14."

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "\$600,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000,000."

On page 2, line 3, it is proposed to strike out "\$270,000,000 and insert in lieu thereof "\$190,000,000."

On page 2, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$180,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$115,000,000."

On page 2, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "\$150,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$95,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in 7 years since 1946 the Congress has authorized and the Federal Government will have spent approximately \$3,500,000,000 for Federal aid to the States for the construction of highways and roads. The details of these authorizations and appropriations are given on the chart inserted between pages 36 and 37 of the Senate committee hearings.

TWENTY BILLION DOLLARS SPENT FOR ROADS SINCE
WORLD WAR II

It will be remembered that this is, of course, merely the Federal share of a joint program. The State and county governments will add at least an equal sum to the Federal appropriation, so the Federal aid appropriations carry with them at least a total of \$7,000,000,000 of appropriations for the construction and improvement of the Federal-aid roads of the country. In addition, there have been appropriations by States and local authorities for nonfederally aided highways. There have also been Federal appropriations for various types of roads which were not a part of the Federal aid system. So I think we can start with the clear knowledge that the United States Government and the State and local governments have spent enormous sums of money for the construction and improvement of the Nation's roads since the conclusion of war. Since World War II the Federal share of the highway funds have amounted to between 10 and 20 percent of all funds spent for roads. Thus, since the war, the country has spent at least \$20,000,000,000 for roads.

CONGRESS TREATS HIGHWAY AUTHORIZATIONS
THE SAME AS APPROPRIATIONS

In the second place, the debates of this year and of preceding years have made it clear that, so far as the Senate and the House are concerned, Congress will treat authorizations as the equivalent of appropriations. This bill is ostensibly an authorization bill and not an appropriation bill. I do not believe that an authorization constitutes any legally binding obligation upon the Federal Government to appropriate the sums of money so authorized. We hold to this point of view with respect to all other

bills except, I believe, this particular type of bill involving highway construction.

As indicated by past votes, this body and the other body are clearly of the opinion that once the authorization is made by Congress and once, indeed, the allocations are fixed by the Bureau of Public Roads for the various States—the Federal Government is then morally committed to appropriate the sums stated. I believe this to be a mistaken point of view and I refer to the Supreme Court decisions in the Charles River Bridge case and Stone against Mississippi to bear me out, but it is the point of view of the Senate and of the House. This point of view is held even though no contracts have been let by the States, and even though the authorization is merely a letter from the Bureau of Public Roads stating that certain sums will be allocated if satisfactory contracts are made. So make no mistake about it: According to past decisions of the Senate, when we pass an authorization bill for Federal highways and for State-aid systems, we are in effect appropriating the money.

TOTAL AUTHORIZATIONS OF OVER THREE-QUARTERS OF A BILLION DOLLARS A YEAR

The pending bill contains total authorizations of \$810,000,000 a year for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, namely, the fiscal year 1953-54 and the fiscal year 1954-55. In some cases, the authorizations are for even longer periods of time. The major share of this \$810,000,000 consists of \$600,000,000 each year for Federal-aid roads, \$50,000,000 each year for interstate highways, and \$50,000,000 for circumferential roads. At least \$600,000,000 of this will have to be met by the States and localities with equal sums. So in effect we are providing for appropriations of at least \$1,400,000,000 a year for roads for each of 2 years.

As I have intimated, in the seven preceding years for which authorizations have been granted, the maximum authorization each year has been \$500,000,000. For two of the years, 1950 and 1951, respectively, the authorizations were \$450,000,000. So the authorization contained in this bill, on the basis of purely Federal-aid roads, is \$100,000,000 a year in excess of the highest authorization provided in the past; and if we include the two added appropriations of \$50,000,000 each for interstate highways and for circumferential roads, making a total of \$700,000,000, it is about \$200,000,000 in excess of the highest appropriations or authorizations of past years—and I shall call them appropriations, because that is what they really are.

This increase is made at a time when the financial situation of the Government is probably at its most desperate point. We need always to remember that the budget submitted by the President called for expenditures of \$85,500,000,000, as against anticipated revenues of only \$71,000,000,000, producing an administrative deficit of at least \$14,000,000,000 for the coming fiscal year. We do not have any real hope that the situation will be any better in 1953-54, or in 1954-55.

CONGRESS SHOULD PRACTICE WHAT IT PREACHES

We criticize the administration from time to time on the excessive amounts of appropriations which they request. I have joined in that criticism. I believe that on the whole the executive departments have not exhibited the degree of prudence in relation to resources which they should observe.

But, Mr. President, in this particular case all that the Bureau of the Budget and the President of the United States asked for, in behalf of the general system of national highways, was \$400,000,000. They did ask for \$81,000,000 more for forest highways, forest development roads, national park roads, parkway roads, Indian reservation roads, the Inter-American Highway, and the Rama Road. But for the Federal-aid road program they requested only \$400,000,000. The committee has reported a bill which

increases the figure from \$400,000,000 to \$700,000,000—\$600,000,000 for the Federal-aid system, \$50,000,000 for interstate highways, and \$50,000,000 for circumferential highways.

That is an increase of \$300,000,000 a year, for each of 2 years. If Members of the Senate, who seem to be startled by my statement will turn to the table submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, which is printed at page 179 of the hearings, they will find confirmation of my statement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in my remarks, a table comparing the individual requests by the executive agencies with those included in the pending bill, S. 2437.

There being no objection, the table was ordered printed, as follows:

Summary of recommended new highway authorizations, compared with provisions of 1950 Highway Act and S. 2437, by program

(In millions of dollars)

Program	Recommended new level	1950 Highway Act	S. 2437
Annual authorizations:			
Federal-aid highways:			
(a) Primary system	200.0	225.0	270.0
(b) Secondary system	100.0	150.0	180.0
(c) Urban system	100.0	125.0	150.0
Total, Federal-aid highways	400.0	500.0	600.0
Forest highways	17.5	20.0	25.0
Forest development roads and trails	17.5	17.5	22.5
National park roads and trails	10.0	10.0	10.0
Parkways	10.0	13.0	10.0
Indian reservation roads	10.0	6.0	10.0
Public lands highways		5.0	2.5
Interstate highways		(1)	50.0
Authorizations not on an annual basis:			
Inter-American Highway (for completion)	56.0	(1)	56.0
Rama Road (for completion)	8.0		8.0
Emergency relief fund		5.0	15.0
Access roads	(2)	10.0	50.0
Total	529.0	586.5	858.0

¹ Authorization for Inter-American Highway was provided in 1950 Highway Act for 2 years, at annual level of \$4,000,000. S. 2437 would provide authorization of \$8,000,000 annually for 7 years, thus providing the same total future authorization as is herein recommended.

² Request of different agencies varied. Bureau of Public Roads made no request.

³ Increased to \$45 million by Public Law 177, 82d Cong.

⁴ Interstate system authorized, but funds were to come from funds allocated to primary and urban systems.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to make an observation, in the belief that the Senator from Illinois would wish to have his statement meticulously correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the Senator from Illinois made one mistake in his statement with reference to the \$700,000,000 figure. His statement apparently referred to the \$50,000,000 authorized in section 10 of the committee bill as coming within the purview of regular road-construction program and as being available in each of the fiscal years. To the contrary, that \$50,000,000 is all for defense highway construction. It is not for each of the fiscal years, but is made available only until expended. Such road construction does not serve as a part of the regular Federal highway system. So I believe the total figure should have been stated as \$650,000,000 instead of \$700,000,000, unless I misunderstood the Senator's statement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator for the emendation. What he says is technically correct. Yet it is also true that there is an added authorization of \$50,000,000, a lump sum, for circumferential highways, which certainly could be woven into the national highway system, and other sums will be requested for the same purpose. Therefore, I should say that it is perhaps a minor correction, but certainly not a major correction.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield again?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. While it is true that a part of the \$50,000,000 might be made available eventually for circumferential highways, it is in reality a defense highway appropriation, and not in any of the years to be used for circumferential highways. It is merely a permissive provision, which would permit a portion of the fund, if needed for circumferential highways, to be so used. The primary purpose of the \$50,000,000, however, is for defense and access road construction. The hearing showed that more than that sum will be needed during the time cov-

ered by the report for strictly defense and access construction purposes, without reference to circumferential highways.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the eminent Senator from Florida whether the administration requested the \$50,000,000 under another request or whether this addition was made by the committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that the administration, through various agencies, took different positions. The Department of Defense requested \$150,000,000. That amount, the Senator will find, was originally included in the bill by the distinguished chairman of the committee in the original section 9, which was stricken by the committee. Other agencies of the administration requested different amounts. The Bureau of the Budget took what the Senator from Florida thought was a very proper position, namely, that this item should be covered by a separate bill. However, we became so pressed for time, and the bill came up so late, that the committee finally agreed to provide only \$50,000,000, with full knowledge of the fact that the actual requirements for defense and access highway construction will exceed that amount. The figures were not substantiated in the way the committee felt they should have been before an actual authorization was made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, if we authorize this additional \$50,000,000 for the purposes indicated in section 10, we can be quite certain that there will be further requests made by the departments affected.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The same is true with reference to the Department of Defense. The Commission made it clear that its requests, which I believe aggregated about \$18,000,000, would be approximately \$40,000,000 before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not wish to debate the point, but would not the Senator from Florida say, therefore, that the Senator from Illinois did not go very far off the beam when he said we would be committed to extra expenditures probably of at least \$100,000,000, not \$50,000,000?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; the Senator is not correct. The amount is needed for defense and access highways. I am sure that the Senator from Illinois will agree that eventually any amount needed will have to be appropriated. The purpose of the committee in providing this amount was to make sure that there would be no holding up of the construction of needed projects in the field of defense and of access highways while the matter was being further studied. The committee was of the opinion that the final sum would be well in excess of \$50,000,000. The Senator is correct in that conclusion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Florida. I should like to point out that my amendment does not propose to reduce the sums provided for circumferential highways; that I did not object when the committee amendment was adopted, and that my amendment is ad-

dressed to the Federal-aid system. I was merely trying to give an over-all picture of the sums the Federal Government is being called upon to appropriate at this time.

Mr. President, how can we properly criticize the executive agencies for asking for excessive sums of money when Congress itself proceeds to spend \$250,000,000 more a year, for each of 2 years, than the administration itself has asked for? Will not our protests with regard to economy fall upon rather deaf ears if on the items which are so popular with Members of the Senate we increase the administration figures by a quarter of a billion dollars each year for 2 years, or by a total of a half billion dollars? We must be consistent in these matters. If we mean economy, we should practice it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe the Senator from Illinois could be mistaken to this extent. No one wants to waste any money, or spend any more money than is necessary. The general public does not pay the tax which provides the funds in question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from New Mexico, Mr. President, that we both have gone over that question again and again. It is understood that the revenues derived from the Federal gasoline tax go into the general funds of the Treasury, and are not allocated, either legally or morally, to the specific purpose of road construction. They are a part of the general revenues of the country. They are not earmarked for road construction, any more than the tax on alcoholic liquors is used for the reform of drunkards or to build more beautiful taverns.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The money is specially provided by the road users for the purpose of road construction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is provided by the road users for the general purposes of the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; for roads. I do not agree with the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The parliamentary record and the constitutional record is perfectly clear that such revenues are not earmarked, but go into the general funds of the Treasury.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will be patient with me, I should like to proceed a little further.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe the Senator is completely wrong, not in trying to save money, but in trying to cut down on something that should be done. The Federal Government collects approximately \$2,000,000,000 from automobile users; but now some persons say that there is involved a waste of money, in spite of the fact that it is proposed that Congress, in order to continue a necessary road system, reduce the authorization to one-quarter of the \$2,000,000,000, or to \$500,000,000 or \$600,000,000.

The Federal Government uses in the General Treasury the remainder of the

money which is paid by the automobile users; and that money does not come from a general tax.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am not a constitutional lawyer; but if my good friend, the Senator from New Mexico, will examine the Butler case, in which the Supreme Court rendered an opinion in 1935, as I recall, he will find that in that case the Supreme Court ruled that the original Agricultural Adjustment Administration was unconstitutional because the tax money collected under it was earmarked. The decision was on that specific point, and I think the opinion in the Butler case is controlling and decisive on that issue.

The revenues collected from gasoline are no more earmarked for the highways than the tax revenues collected from liquor are earmarked for the reform of drunkards, or the tax revenues collected on tobacco are earmarked to be used to cure people of the tobacco habit.

I see my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] rising, no doubt to ask a question: Of course, he is known not to be addicted to the use of either liquor or tobacco; and, accordingly, he does not need to be cured of those habits. Therefore, I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. KERR. I suppose my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, realizes that the past week end saw the largest number of traffic fatalities that have occurred in any week end during the history of the Nation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was on the roads at that time, and I believe the statement the Senator from Oklahoma has made is a correct one.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator from Illinois aware that in view of the terrific increase in the number of automotive units on the highways and the fact that we are not building highways as rapidly as they are being worn out or becoming obsolete, the traffic conditions on our highways cannot fail to result in still greater fatalities, unless we not only improve the safety factors on our highways, but also enlarge the highways, so they will be adequate for the great volume of traffic they have to carry?

Mr. DOUGLAS. In reply, let me inquire whether my good friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, is aware of the fact that since the war the Federal Government has appropriated \$3,500,000,000 for Federal-aid highways, which amount, when added to the State and local appropriations, represents a minimum of \$7,000,000,000, and that total expenditures for this purpose have been about \$20,000,000,000? The poor highways are not being starved. Is my friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, aware of that fact?

Mr. KERR. I am aware of it, but—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted that the Senator from Oklahoma is aware of that fact.

Mr. KERR. But I am also aware of the well-established fact that even so, we do not have today a highway system sufficient for the traffic it carries. Indeed, it is insufficient by a very substantial percentage; and in proportion to the traffic it bears, it is not comparable

to the highway system we had prior to World War II.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the eminent Senator from Oklahoma aware of the fact that the budget, as submitted for the current year, will cause a deficit of \$14,000,000,000, and that in order to meet that budget, the Government will have to float bonds, with a resultant increase in bank credit and inflation? Does the Senator from Oklahoma think those facts have any place in this discussion?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I am perfectly aware of the point the Senator from Illinois has made, namely, that there will be a deficit in the budget of the Federal Government for the coming fiscal year.

However, I wish to ask my friend, the Senator from Illinois, this question: As between a slightly greater financial deficit, on the one hand, and a greater deficit in human lives, on the other hand, which would the Senator from Illinois choose?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me ask my eminent friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, whether he read the road article which appeared in last Sunday's issue of the magazine, *This Week*. In that article it is stated—and it is stated on good authority, I believe—that the new superhighways in many cases are more dangerous than the older ones were. The article states:

Critics of the superroads label the turnpike "speedways to death." The fact remains that our superhighways, built to eliminate most driving hazards, have created others of their own.

Some of the new hazards listed were inducements to greater speed, "high-speed hypnosis," and "outside factors." Has the Senator from Oklahoma read this article?

Mr. KERR. I did not read the article.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I advise the Senator from Oklahoma to read the article. He will find it very informative.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to my friend, the Senator from Illinois, that I do not care who says better highways increase traffic fatalities on the roads; anyone who makes that statement is mistaken. I know that not only from the studies I made as Governor of my State, but also from the studies I have made as a member of the Committee on Public Works. I must say that common sense would compel us to realize that better roads and safer roads would decrease traffic fatalities, rather than increase them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, at the conclusion of my remarks, the article on roads which appeared in last Sunday's issue of the magazine *This Week*. I make this request in order that both the Senator from Oklahoma and I may study the article.

Mr. KERR. I thank my friend for the opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of Mr. DOUGLAS' remarks.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Are we to understand that the Senator from Illinois is arguing that we should not have better highways?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, not at all. I am simply proposing that we should not overtax the United States in connection with our spending for highways.

Mr. LONG. Of course the Senator from Illinois knows that the amount we pay for gasoline taxes, according to the statement I have heard here, is more than the amount that we are spending for highways. I believe the public would like to feel that the money it is paying in gasoline taxes will be used for highway construction.

I know that in my State the members of the public pay a high gasoline tax. Obviously they would be somewhat more receptive to that tax if they felt they were getting highways for it, rather than to have the tax money used for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana, that I think probably he was not in the Chamber a few minutes ago when I had a colloquy on this point with the Senator from New Mexico.

It is clearly established, particularly by the Butler decision on the Agricultural Adjustment Administration Act in 1935, that under our constitutional system, taxes cannot be earmarked for expenditure on specific projects or for specific purposes. All taxes must move into the General Treasury, and the appropriating function is then separated from the taxing function. That is clear.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator from Illinois will find that if the Government decides to do so, it can dedicate funds.

If I correctly recall—and I say frankly that I have not read the case for a long time—the Butler case merely involved a standing to sue, in a case in which a taxpayer was arguing that he had a right to sue against a program under which the funds were dedicated to use in an unconstitutional purpose.

Nevertheless, I believe the Senator from Illinois will find that if the Government desires to earmark funds for a particular purpose, so long as that purpose is authorized and is within the constitutional power of the Government, that can be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I have said, I am not a constitutional lawyer, and I certainly do not wish to pretend that my opinions are authoritative; but, as I remember that case, the revenues derived from the processing tax established by the original Triple A Act were to be used for the specific purpose of paying bonuses to farmers who restricted output. The Court held that such an earmarking of funds was in itself unconstitutional. So I think there is a very clear decision on that point.

I believe the point to which the Senator from Louisiana had reference was first raised in the Federal-aid suit which

was begun in the State of Massachusetts and which was decided in the case of *Frothingham against Mellon*, a case in which the Supreme Court, by unanimous opinion, declared that a suit of an individual taxpayer to restrain enforcement of an act of Congress authorizing appropriations of public money, upon the ground that the act is invalid, cannot be entertained in equity—Two Hundred and Sixty-second United States Statutes, page 448.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly; I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Certainly within many States and, I know, within my own State, there is the principle of dedication of funds. In many States, funds are dedicated to roads.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; that is true on the State level; but I believe the Senator from Louisiana will find that on the Federal level that is constitutionally impossible. On the Federal level, the revenues, when collected, have to be mixed with the general revenues, rather than be siphoned off for specific purposes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. I have only one question at this point.

Will the Senator from Illinois estimate the dollar amount which would be required thoroughly to modernize the Nation's highway system, if our assumption is that we have available to be spent all the money we want to spend on important national projects?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I doubt if experts could ever agree on such a question. I would say to the Senator from Washington that if we take each of the amounts which it is said is absolutely essential in order to develop essential projects, and if we combine all those figures, we arrive at a total figure infinitely greater than the resources of the United States.

I believe I heard the Senator from New Mexico state that a total of \$32,000,000,000 would be required for the highways of the country. I have heard similar statements. In connection with flood control it was said that \$60,000,000,000 would be needed. I have heard statements to the effect that in order to provide adequate irrigation systems \$40,000,000,000 or \$50,000,000,000 would be needed, and that in order to provide other improvements of one kind or another, \$30,000,000,000 or \$40,000,000,000 more would be required.

The point is that each group pushes its demands to perfection, to the point where there must be an absolutely perfect system. My contention is that the resources of the United States are not unlimited, that a point is reached where the returns in productivity from a given unit of investment decline, and that we cannot push everything to perfection. We cannot have in any near future a perfect highway system, a perfect irrigation system, a perfect rivers-and-har-

bor system, a perfect navigation system; everything perfect. We become guilty of the great fault which is common in the Army of thinking that each piece of equipment must be prepared for every emergency, and that the tables of organization must provide for all emergencies happening simultaneously. There is in that idea a startling logical fallacy.

Mr. CAIN. The distinguished Senator, however, appears to be stating that he has given no particular personal study to the present status of the Nation's highway system.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ride over the highways, I read books about the highways. I do not pretend to be an expert or an authority upon the subject of highways, but I do know something about the general financial situation of the country. I am trying as best I can, undoubtedly imperfectly, to fit this request for highway appropriations into the general financial picture of the country.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator for his answer.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The junior Senator from Virginia desires first to comment on the suggestion of his colleague from the State of Washington [Mr. CAIN], which is that, in view of the fact that we now have approximately 50,000,000 motor vehicles, including automobiles, trucks, and so forth, our highway system is by no means adequate.

The junior Senator from Virginia wholly endorses the statement of the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the resources of the United States are not inexhaustible. We have a direct national debt of \$260,000,000,000. We have an indirect debt ranging from \$50,000,000 to \$100,000,000,000. We have accumulated pension demands estimated by some to be as high as \$250,000,000,000. We have a contemplated expenditure within the coming fiscal year of \$80,000,000,000. We have a contemplated deficit in the coming fiscal year of \$11,800,000,000. I wholly agree with the distinguished Senator from Illinois that, until we can get past the highly inflationary effect of deficit spending, on top of back-breaking debts and taxation, we should prudently curtail wherever possible all domestic expenditures.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I can tell this distinguished body that when we authorize funds for State aid to highways we have to appropriate those funds, because we of the Appropriations Committee are not in a position to cut them down after the authorizations come to us. The Bureau of Public Roads says, "We have allocated these funds to the States, they have let their contracts, they have started work, and the Federal Government must pay what has been allocated." They allocate it before Congress ever appropriates.

As I understand, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois would reduce the total of Federal highway aid. The Senator from Virginia frankly admits that the improvement of our highways is one of

the most valuable works to which the Federal Government contributes. We receive value from it, because it is under the jurisdiction of the States, and they put up 50 percent of the money and are therefore cautious with their own money. We need the roads. But the Senator from Virginia understands that the Senator from Illinois seeks to reduce the total aid for primary roads to the budget estimate of \$200,000,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It amounts to an appropriation of the total figure recommended by the budget of \$200,000,000 for each of the next 2 years for primary roads.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then the Senator from Virginia understands that the Senator from Illinois has slightly modified the allocation of the budget, which was to be \$200,000,000 for arterial highways, \$100,000,000 for the farm-to-market roads, and \$100,000,000 for urban development.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that my allocation is a little more favorable to the rural roads than to the urban. Coming from an urban area myself, I leaned over backwards to be fair to the rural areas.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then the reports which the junior Senator from Virginia received, that the Senator was leaning over backward in favor of the big cities was in error, and I am very happy to join with him in being a little more liberal to the rural areas and in assistance to our farmers, if I correctly understand that to be the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then do I correctly understand that the amendment would take \$10,000,000 from the so-called arterial or tourist roads, and add \$10,000,000 to the farm-to-market roads, and not to the urban roads? Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from Virginia will look at the hearings, on page 179—I presume there is a copy of the hearings on his desk—he will find the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget, called for \$200,000,000 for the primary system, \$100,000,000 for the secondary system, and \$100,000,000 for the urban roads.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Unfortunately, the Senator from Virginia does not have before him a copy of the hearings. The Senator from Illinois can tell me.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The recommended new level for the urban system was \$100,000,000. In other words, the percentages were 50, 25, and 25.

I changed that to provide \$190,000,000 for the primary system instead of \$200,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget; \$115,000,000 for the secondary or rural roads, instead of \$100,000,000, and \$95,000,000 for the urban roads, instead of \$100,000,000. In other words, I gave a break to the secondary roads, although we proposed to cut both secondary and urban roads in a somewhat greater proportion than the primary system. I think there are dubious grounds, for going into this system of secondary roads, but I did not want to raise that

issue in this connection, and I leaned over backward as a matter of fact to be fair, excessively fair, to the rural areas.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The junior Senator from Virginia was a cosponsor of the bill which created the State highway department in Virginia, of a bill to create a State highway system, and he was a member of the commission which laid out that highway system. He has followed the development of roads in Virginia with great interest ever since. At the present time we have approximately 50,000 miles of highways in Virginia, and with all due modesty, the Senator from Virginia believes that the Virginia system compares favorably with that of any other State. We do not have a dollar of road debt or of any other debt. In fact, the revenue was so much above receipts that we refunded 20 percent of the income taxes last year.

Of course, I wish the Federal Government were in as good condition as that. In Virginia we have about 4 miles of rural roads for each mile of arterial roads, and I can frankly say that the increased percentage for rural roads proposed by the Senator from Illinois would be quite popular in Virginia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Virginia. I appreciate the statesmanship of the Senator from Virginia in supporting the proposed reduction of \$200,000,000 or back to the budget total. I should like to make two comments about the matter, namely, that generally, in my judgment, the Bureau of the Budget and the executive agencies are commonly too liberal in recommending appropriations, but here is a case where Congress exceeds the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget by \$250,000,000 a year for each of 2 years, or a 60-percent increase above the figures of the Bureau of the Budget. I think in this bill we should go back to the Bureau's figures.

The second point I should like to make is that one of the great organizations of this country is the American Farm Bureau Federation. It is composed, in the main, of successful farmers who use the roads perhaps more than do any other single group. It would be thought, therefore, if they consulted their own interests, that they would be in favor of very large appropriations for roads, but the American Farm Bureau in the past 2 years has taken the most statesman-like attitude as to public expenditures of any organized group in the Nation. They have subordinated their class interests in appropriations to the general desire for national solvency. We shall find some of their suggestions coming up when we consider the agricultural appropriation bill at a later date.

The American Farm Bureau has taken a stand. It filed a statement with two congressional committees, recommending that the authorization be held at the \$400,000,000 level recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for each of the next 2 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the American Farm Bureau be printed at this point in my remarks, but I should like to read certain passages from it for the benefit of the Senate.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FB ASKS \$200,000,000 CUT IN FEDERAL-AID ROAD FUNDS—CONGRESS TOLD BALANCED BUDGET MORE ESSENTIAL

The American Farm Bureau Federation, in a statement filed with two congressional committees, has recommended that the Federal aid authorization for Federal Aid Highway Systems be held at the \$400,000,000 level for each of the next 2 years.

That would be \$100,000,000, or a 20-percent cut, under the authorization for each of the past 2 years.

The statement was filed with the House and Senate Public Works Committees which recently concluded hearings on Federal-aid road bills.

AFBF said that, while adequate rural roads are essential to satisfactory farm living standards, "we must, without fail, reduce the Federal budget so that we can pay the bill."

"The construction and maintenance of highways requires great sums of money annually," the statement said. "The Federal Government is faced with a heavy financial burden to prepare our Nation for defense. It becomes necessary, therefore, to make a choice between having all roads in the highest state of utility which we would like, and which we believe are ultimately necessary, and expenditures deemed necessary to prepare our Nation to defend itself."

The farm bureau said it is convinced that State governments are able to maintain the standards of construction and maintenance of highways "for which they have long had the major share of financial and administrative responsibility—a responsibility which we believe should be continued and strengthened."

As for the division of Federal highway aid between primary, secondary, and roads for urban areas, AFBF recommended that it be made on the same basis as provided in the 1950 act. That act authorized 45 percent of the total authorization for primary systems, 30 percent for the secondary system including rural roads, and 25 percent for roads in urban areas.

The AFBF suggested that "as the defense effort diminishes that Congress should promptly take cognizance of the conditions of the highways and begin preparation for a more adequate program of maintenance, improvement, and construction."

Mr. DOUGLAS. I now read a paragraph from the statement, as follows:

The construction and maintenance of highways require great sums of money annually. The Federal Government is faced with a heavy financial burden to prepare our Nation for defense. It becomes necessary, therefore, to make a choice between having all roads in the highest state of utility which we would like, and which we believe are ultimately necessary, and expenditures deemed necessary to prepare our Nation to defend itself.

The recommendation of this great organization is that the appropriation—and I call it an appropriation because it is such; it is not merely an authorization; it is not legally an appropriation, but in practice it is an appropriation—be reduced by \$200,000,000.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to invite the Senator's attention to the provision of his amendment, ignoring for the moment the total amount, which

makes a division of the funds as between the primary system, the secondary system, and the urban system of roads. The Senator from Illinois will recall that the historic formula agreed on by the Congress for a number of years was based on testimony and trial and error. It provides that 45 percent shall be allotted to the primary system, 30 percent to the secondary system, and 25 percent to the urban system, which is the primary system in the cities. The Senator changes that distribution—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very slightly.

Mr. STENNIS. In the case of the primary system from 45 to 47 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. In the case of the secondary system from 30 to 39 percent, and in the case of the urban system from 25 to 24 percent. The Senator has not given a reason for this change as yet.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The change is a very minute one. It is really designed as a compromise between the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and the recommendations in the pending bill. The Bureau recommended a division on the basis of 50 percent for primary roads, 25 percent for secondary or feeder roads, and 25 percent for urban roads. My proposal is half way in between—47½ percent for primary roads instead of the 45 percent and the 50 percent recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, and 29 percent for rural roads instead of the present 30 and 24 percent for urban highways instead of 25 percent.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Mississippi to the fact that, again, the Senator from Illinois has been more generous in the reductions he has proposed toward the rural areas than toward the urban areas, as compared with the proposal of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. STENNIS. As a matter of fact, the Senator, more or less by a stroke of the pen, is changing the historic formula which has worked well over the years, and he is doing it without any scientific basis or any hearings or facts on which to base the change. Is not that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Mississippi will forgive me if I say that if he opposes the amendment on that ground, he is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. What I am really proposing is that we get back to the total figures of the Bureau of the Budget, namely, \$400,000,000, giving the rural roads a little more than the Bureau of the Budget gave them—

Mr. STENNIS. What reason does the Bureau give and what reason does the Senator give for making this change? First, what reason did the Bureau of the Budget give?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Mississippi and I had a colloquy, I believe, 2 years ago on this very point. It is very difficult to establish a case where secondary roads are of equal importance with primary roads. Feeder roads should primarily be the responsibility of the States and localities. If we do not believe in the Federal Government interfering in local affairs, why should

the Federal Government build feeder roads from towns off the main highways? I know this is a somewhat unwary statement of mine, because my present proposal has nothing to do with that issue. I merely think that in the long run the Senator from Mississippi—I know he has done it in perfect good faith—has suggested a precedent which is dangerous to the distribution of responsibility between the Federal Government and the State governments, and, without meaning to do so, he has been advocating a big Federal Government at the expense of localities. But I waive that point. My primary purpose is to get a reduction of \$200,000,000, while at the same time decreasing the percentage for rural roads from 30 to 29 percent and urban roads from 25 to 24 percent.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator takes from the secondary system a part of the fund and allots it to the primary system. We recognized the increased need of the primary system when we provided initially a \$50,000,000 fund for the so-called interstate system. Does not the Senator think that whatever problem there is in connection with the primary roads can well be handled by establishing the interstate system and designating so much money as the Congress may see fit to provide to take care of the increased burden without disturbing the time-proved formula?

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I am trying to effect is a reduction of one-third in the total appropriation—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me state what I am trying to effect, please. Would not the Senator from Mississippi support this proposal if we made a flat reduction of one-third in the items, which would mean reducing the sum for primary highways from \$270,000,000 to \$180,000,000; reducing the amount for the secondary system from \$180,000,000 to \$120,000,000 instead of \$115,000,000; and reducing the sum for urban roads from \$150,000,000 to \$95,000,000?

Would the Senator from Mississippi, under those conditions, support my amendment? I am ready to present it if I can get his support.

Mr. STENNIS. The top figure is a debatable matter to be decided in the wisdom of the individual Members after hearing the facts. I voted in recognition of the increased traffic on our highways. That is a matter to be decided. I do not argue it particularly, but I want to preserve the formula. I submit that even though the Senator can rightly favor a decreased figure, he is not justified in disturbing the formula.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say that the Senator from Mississippi is really straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. He is straining at a 1-percent reduction in the formula, but is swallowing a \$200,000,000 added authorization. I say that with pain, because there is no Member of the Senate for whom I have greater respect than the Senator from Mississippi, who is always courteous, fair-minded, generous, and kindly. I say that sincerely.

Mr. STENNIS. The \$200,000,000 is certainly based upon a very strong array of undisputed facts which justify that amount.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is really an increase of \$250,000,000, as the Senator knows.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If I understood the Senator from Illinois correctly, he was objecting very strenuously to having the Federal Government control some of the roads contemplated. Nevertheless, he is willing to trust the Bureau of the Budget, but not a committee of this body. The difficulty with the Senator from Illinois is that at times he tries to give the impression that he is the only one who is trying to be honest in these days.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from time to time the Senator from New Mexico has implied that that was the effort of the senior Senator from Illinois. There was an indirect reference made to the same effect yesterday by the Senator from New Mexico. There have been previous references of that kind, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show.

I may say that it is not pleasant for the Senator from Illinois to stand on the floor of the Senate and propose reductions. I know perfectly well that when I do, I am stepping on the toes of Members of the Senate who are interested, and honestly interested, in the program under discussion.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. First I wish to complete my reply to the Senator from New Mexico, who has made a direct implication that I believe I am the only Member of the Senate who tries to be honest or economical. I may say that that is not my purpose, intention, or idea at all. I think that I am conscious of my own faults. I do not pretend that I am right all the time. I know I am wrong some of the time, though I cannot pick out the individual occasions when I am wrong. But I have had to assume an ungrateful task—and I know how ungrateful it is. I know the natural tendency of Senators is to accept committee reports, lest we hurt the feelings of the chairmen and members of the committees. The result is that unless some Senator rises on the floor of the Senate and at least questions the reports of committees, bills go through with great speed.

In the pending bill, and in other bills which have come before the Senate, it seems to me that, on the whole, committees have been recommending the appropriation of larger sums of money than the financial situation of the country justifies. Believe me, I had to summon up my courage this morning when I rose to offer this amendment. Unpleasant as it is to me, without any idea at all that I am superior to any other Member of the Senate, because I know I am not, I have to move in a direction which, on the whole, seems to me to be in the public interest.

I wish the Senator from New Mexico, who is a very fine gentleman, would not constantly imply that because I desire to effect economy, I therefore believe I have

a monopoly on virtue, and that I think I am always right. I only ask that to the degree to which my arguments have merit, and only to that degree, they be considered by Senators. I am sure they will not be considered by them with any prejudice in my favor. I simply ask that they be considered with as little prejudice against me as the arguments may warrant.

Does the Senator from New Mexico wish to make any reply? I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. THYE. I followed very carefully the explanation of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I personally wish to commend him for his efforts to economize, not only on this particular item, but on other items of appropriations. Had I not studied the problems of various State highway departments as thoroughly as it was necessary for me to study them some years ago, when I had the responsibilities of State government, and as I have studied them in later years, I would not have found that there is a great demand upon all States of the Union, as well as the Federal Government, to improve highways because of the tremendous traffic demands upon them. We see our roads destroyed faster than we are able to build or maintain them. There is not one of us who could not drive into our States and find highways which have been literally pounded to pieces in the past 6 months by the heavy traffic to which they have been subjected.

Within the past 6 weeks it was necessary for me to drive practically the full length of the State of Minnesota. Highways which I had personally observed constructed in the past 10 years were literally going to pieces on grades and in the cuts of hills, where the so-called bottom or support of the concrete slab was not sufficient to keep the concrete from breaking and cracking up.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Illinois for allowing me the opportunity to make these few comments. I know I am trespassing on his time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no.

Mr. THYE. I appreciate his courtesy. There is no person for whom I have greater admiration, not only because of his courage, but also his understanding of government, than the senior Senator from Illinois.

Reverting to the highway question, any of us who stand here and oppose a \$200,000,000 economy move are immediately going to be attacked by the taxpayers, because they will think us spendthrifts. They will think we have no common sense left within us. I take that chance by speaking in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The senior Senator from Illinois will never say or think that the Senator from Minnesota is a spendthrift or devoid of common sense. We can have honest differences of opinion on these matters without labeling each

other as tax wasters or as undue penny pinchers.

Mr. THYE. Every single month additional fleets of semitrailer trucks go out on the highways. They pay a tax, it is true. They not only pay a user's tax, but they pay taxes on oil, gasoline, tires, and accessories. All that is revenue for the Federal Government which aids in defraying the expenses of government, and certainly it is a form of revenue which was supported at the time of the first enactment of the legislation by the great users of the highways, for the reason that if the tax were imposed and revenue was derived there would be an improvement made in the arterial highway system of this land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No such contract was ever made, either implicitly or explicitly.

Mr. THYE. I will grant that there was no such contract written into the statute.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There was no such understanding.

Mr. THYE. But in the public hearings there was moral support for the legislation when it was before the committee, and when the proposed additional tax was being advocated in legislative measures, the users of highways oftentimes supported such measures. Only in that way could such a bill gather the support necessary to make it possible of enactment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have just read into the RECORD a statement by the group representing the largest users of the highways, the American Farm Bureau. Much as they want highways, they believe that the financial condition of the country is so critical that we should authorize not \$600,000,000, but instead \$400,000,000, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and by the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I fully appreciate the importance of that very fine farm organization. I have been affiliated with it during all the years of my adult life. I fully appreciate the splendid public service it always renders. I wish to support it in every instance in which I can do so. If I had not seen the highway conditions in some of the Northwest States, as I have had the privilege of witnessing them in the past year, and had I not seen what I thought was a perfect pavement 10 years ago pounded to pieces in the past 2 or 3 years because of excessive traffic on the highways and the excess tonnage to which the highways are subjected, I would be inclined to say that I would follow the recommendations of the farm organization and of the senior Senator from Illinois.

If I had not seen with my own eyes that the State highway departments and the county highway organizations, as well as the supervisors in charge of the township roads, are unable to maintain them and keep pace with the ever increasing traffic on the highways; and if I had not witnessed these things as one who had the responsibility of State government for several years, I would not stand here and oppose the recommendation of the fine farm organization to which reference has been made, nor

would I be so bold as to oppose the very able and studious Senator from Illinois. But I am compelled by my own convictions and my own observations to try to give aid to the State highway commissioners, who are unable to meet the demands made upon them in the construction and maintenance of highways for which they have responsibility.

If in the event of a great emergency our transportation system should fail, we would be criticized as a legislative body for having neglected to aid the highway departments in the States to meet the demands upon them in the construction and maintenance of highways adequate to carry the load of today, and the anticipated load of tomorrow. The revenue from gasoline and lubricating oil alone is \$694,000,000. The tax on automobiles, trucks, accessories, and tires amounts to a total of \$1,005,000,000. In the present fiscal year the revenue is bound to be increased by reason of increased taxes written into the tax measure of a year ago.

That is the reason why I feel that in the pending bill the committee was entirely justified in recommending \$600,000,000 for Federal aid for highways in the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had really finished my remarks when the Senator from Minnesota began. I now yield the floor.

EXHIBIT 1

HOW TO STAY ALIVE ON SUPERHIGHWAYS (By Norman Carlisle and Leonard Paris)

A new era of high-speed automobile travel is forcing us all to adjust our sights. Within the next 2 years it should be possible to drive all the way from Portland, Maine, to Chicago without a traffic light. On superhighways cutting wide swaths across the Nation, we're unsnarling traffic tangles that have plagued us for years.

But we are also killing ourselves and each other on these same dream roads. For despite every precaution highway police could take, more people were killed on the parkways and superhighways last year than ever before. The skyrocketing rate of traffic strongly indicates that 1952 will set new and grimmer records.

Critics of the super-roads label the turnpikes "speedways to death." Fair charge or not, the fact remains that our superhighways, built to eliminate most driving hazards, have created others of their own.

Chief among these hazards is speed. It is still the No. 1 killer on all roads. It is an even greater menace on the superhighways. Without traffic lights, crossroads, sharp curves, or steep grades, the motorist can zip along at a rate he's never dared before. His chances of an accident caused by speed are therefore much greater.

A second danger on the superhighways is something called "high-speed hypnosis"—a trance-like state induced by mile after mile of effortless driving. In its acute stage it may become actual dozing. In its more insidious form it is a temporary loss of alertness.

The third hazard of the superhighways is one which no driver and no safety engineer can control. It is the danger of accidents caused by outside factors—the weather, mechanical failures, and what the other fellow may do. This danger, too, is common to all roads, but it is doubly terrifying on the superhighways because of speed.

Let's look at these dangers, one by one, and see what you, as a driver, can do about them. First, speed.

The matter of safe speed is, of course, relative. It's not just a figure on a signpost; it's the rate at which you still have your car in control. On a bumpy, winding road, that may be 35. On a superhighway, it could be twice that fast. It depends on you, the driver.

What may be a safe speed for someone else may not be for you. You can go 70 miles an hour on the Pennsylvania Turnpike. That's the legal limit. And many a driver who's never been over 50 before will cut loose on that broad white band of concrete. Why not? What can happen?

Plenty, say the experts. Particularly if you're not used to doing 70. "Most of us," says Burton W. Marsh, director of the Traffic Safety Department of the AAA, "simply aren't so constructed that we can come from months of driving experience at speeds of from 25 to 55 miles per hour, and suddenly drive upwards of 70 without greatly increasing the danger of accidents."

RULES FOR TURNPIKES

The Pennsylvania Turnpikes' police coordinator, Joe Vent, suggests that every driver's license ought to carry the top rate at which the particular driver can safely travel. So rule No. 1 for superhighway drivers is: Drive only at your safe speed. If you're used to driving no more than 60, don't go above it.

So many accidents on the turnpikes just needn't have happened. Just before Christmas last year, only 43 days after New Jersey's new 118-mile turnpike was opened to traffic, five United States marines were killed on the road when their car struck the rear end of a truck. The giant vehicle was pulling back onto the right-hand lane after stopping on the shoulder, when the homeward-bound marines crashed into it. Tragic as this accident was, and needless as it seems in view of the wide passing areas and ample shoulders, it was a common variety of turnpike wreck.

Time after time on the superhighways, speeding automobiles have crashed into the rear of others traveling slower. Attempting to pass a slow-moving vehicle, they have misgauged their distances and failed to turn out soon enough. Some motorists, turning into roadside service stations, have plunged headlong into parked cars. Apparently they did not realize how long it would take them to stop at such a high rate of speed.

Thus we come to rule No. 2: Remember that speed can stretch your reaction time. It will take you many times as much space to turn out or stop when you're traveling at top speed.

A corollary of this rule, prompted by the large number of smash-ups resulting when a passing car cuts in front too soon, has been stated by G. B. Gilbert, the Pennsylvania Turnpike's assistant chairman:

Rule No. 3: Perfect your technique of passing at high speeds. You've been used to getting back into your lane as fast as possible. Turnpike experts warn, "Take your time."

WHEN YOU FORGET SPEED

Another thing about speed. After miles of driving with your foot to the floor, you get used to it. You're doing 70, but you feel and act as if it were 40. The experts call it "velocity." Whatever its name, it can play tricks on you and your ability to act in an emergency. Unless you're aware all the time of how fast you're going, you may try to stop on a dime as you would in city traffic.

Rule No. 4, therefore, is: Remember that speed grows on you. A long superhighway can become so familiar that you forget how fast you're going. If you drive at night, keep a dashboard light on the speedometer to remind you.

In high-speed driving, the penalties for any mistakes are terribly high. A brief mo-

ment's inattention can mean the difference between life and death.

In an accident on the Pennsylvania Turnpike, a young driver simply took one hand from the wheel to adjust the seat. He was traveling so fast that he lost control and crashed into a bridge abutment. No safety engineer could have prevented the death of the three persons in that car.

Rule No. 5: Make driving your only business on the road. If you want to light a cigarette, fiddle with the radio, or reach into the glove compartment, pull off onto the shoulder.

So far, our rules about speed do not vary a great deal from the common sense we've been hearing for years. But some drivers seem to feel that common sense can be forgotten on the superhighways. "After all," they point out, "these roads were built for speed and safety."

That's true. The super-roads under construction today are engineered for as much safety as the experts can put in them. Lessons learned every day on the turnpikes are being translated into new safety measures. Passing zones are being widened. Opposing lanes of traffic are being separated by broader strips, often with inside shoulders. Flashing traffic signals to warn of danger are being installed.

But no matter how good the engineering, you as a driver can be hurt by the new and unaccustomed speed you're allowed. As the National Safety Council puts it: "The faster you go, the less time there is to get out of a jam."

That is a good thing to remember about the first—and greatest—hazard of the superhighways: speed.

The second big danger on the turnpikes is "high-speed hypnosis." Whether it is a by-product of speed or of monotony and other factors, nobody knows for sure. The way the AAA experts figure it, the steady hum of the tires, the unbroken purr of the engine, the effortless driving somehow create a spell that turns the driver into a robot without conscious control of his car. Psychologists of the driving laboratory at Iowa State College are studying the phenomenon, but it is too early for final results.

HYPNOTIZED DRIVERS

Dr. A. R. Lauer, director of the driving laboratory, points out that almost all hypnotic techniques involve concentration on some specific object for a period of time, with as few distractions as possible. These conditions are met on the highway by driving steadily behind another vehicle for mile after mile, without distractions.

For instance, a car may travel along a superhighway at about the same speed as a truck, rolling along behind it evenly. Then the truck slows, pulls off onto the shoulder. As if drawn by an invisible tow-line, the car behind turns off too, but fails to slow down and crashes into the rear of the truck.

Fantastic? Perhaps, but it has happened more than once. How else can we explain those weird rear-end collisions where there are no skidmarks on the pavement, indicating that the driver didn't even try to stop? It's as though he hadn't seen the car ahead at all.

No one knows how many accidents are caused by highway hypnosis. There is no way to find out. You can't question a dead driver. Those who walk away from wrecks will seldom admit that they've wool-gathered at the wheel.

But most motorists will admit that highway hypnosis does exist. They've experienced it themselves. On ordinary highways they are jolted out of it by the rigors of the road—lights, turns, crossroads, opposing traffic. But on superhighways they can drive in a semidaze for miles, unable to collect their wits when a crisis arises. And since they're going so fast, if anything does happen, it's likely to be fatal.

DEATH FOR SLEEPERS

The hazard is increased with every mile of distance. On a road like the Pennsylvania Turnpike, which sweeps along for 327 miles (with more being added), highway hypnosis becomes something to look out for. Without a grade over 3 percent, without a pedestrian, a red light, or a town, any driver may succumb to hypnosis.

Some motorists actually do go to sleep at the wheel. It can happen to you, if you start out feeling tired. On the turnpike your drowsiness can be aggravated by speed, monotony, and the absence of driving challenges. But you can do one big thing to fight it:

Rule No. 6: Get plenty of rest before you start a long drive on a superhighway. Don't drive if you're feeling tired.

Engineers recognize the danger of hypnosis. To combat it on the newer superhighways, they have been ingenious. On the New Jersey Turnpike, for instance, long straight tangents have been purposely avoided, with the thought that occasional gentle curves will serve to keep drivers alert. Ohio is considering using alternate strips of concrete and bituminous pavement on its new turnpike, to give drivers a frequent change in driving conditions. The distance between opposite-bound lanes of travel may also be varied, and the levels of the lanes in relation to each other, as on the Taconic State Parkway in New York.

But engineering alone cannot solve the problem. You can help to protect yourself from highway hypnosis by following rule No. 7: When momentary diversions fail to keep you alert, pull off the road and rest a while before proceeding.

The third and final menace of the superhighways comes from outside factors: weather, mechanical failures, and the other fellow.

Fog, rain, snow, sleet, and ice are responsible for thousands of traffic accidents every year. Yet there are many drivers who seem to feel that the laws of nature are suspended on the superhighways. Most of the turnpikes have maintenance crews which erect warning signals at strategic points when the weather is hazardous. But the driver must use his own good judgment as well.

Rule No. 8: In bad weather, the superhighway becomes almost as hazardous as an old-fashioned road. Drive accordingly. Cut your speed at least in half.

The posted limit may be 70 miles an hour, but with death lurking in treacherous spots on the road, you'd be crazy to drive at that speed.

A BLOWOUT AT 70

Another outside factor which causes accidents is mechanical failure. A blowout can happen anywhere. If it happens on a superhighway when you're doing 70, your chances of a crack-up are much greater. The same is true of any failure of the brakes or the steering mechanism. Anything that goes wrong will be twice as bad on the turnpikes, because of speed.

Therefore, rule No. 9: Have your car checked thoroughly before you start. Remember that high-speed travel may actually cause mechanical trouble, particularly if your car isn't used to being driven fast.

Finally we come to the other fellow. Turnpikes are designed to allow you plenty of room to pass or be passed, and maximum protection from oncoming and cross-traffic. But this very sense of security may breed overconfidence. You can still be endangered by someone else's mistake.

So our tenth and final rule for safety on the superhighways goes like this: Remember that turnpike driving is no cinch. It requires skill, experience, and the ability to deal with emergencies.

In each of these 10 rules, the emphasis is on you, the driver. Engineers and safety

experts have already done their part to make the turnpikes safe.

THE SHORTER, THE SAFER

This can be demonstrated on the shorter expressways, where the driver has less chance to build up steady speed and a false sense of security. The Detroit Industrial Expressway, for instance, had an accident rate for 1 year about a seventh as high as that of a parallel, old-fashioned highway. But both roads were only about 15 miles long.

In California, the Arroyo Seco Parkway kept its accident rate for one 7-year period five to six times lower than that of a comparable, but conventional, thoroughfare, Wilshire Boulevard. But again, the distance was only about 5 miles.

Connecticut's Merrit Parkway shows a fatality rate about one-third that of the Boston Post Road, which parallels it for some 37 miles. The Maine and New Hampshire Turnpikes both report extremely low fatality rates, but they are short roads—36 and 15 miles—and their volume of traffic is not nearly so heavy as that of the Pennsylvania and New Jersey Turnpikes.

These figures seem to add up to one fact: the driver's hazards on superhighways are increased by speed and distance.

This is something to remember as New York State begins construction on the longest turnpike of all: 536 miles from New York City to Buffalo through Albany; as Ohio and Indiana map plans for new superhighways, and as the whole Nation prepares to get behind the push for better roads.

It need not distress us, however. Instead, we can prepare to enjoy trouble-free travel on the best roads in the world, if we know the dangers and how to cope with them. These 10 rules can make the turnpikes highways to safety instead of speedways to death.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while we are talking about uneven highways, we might talk a little about the tortuous and rough fiscal road which this Government must travel in the days ahead.

If there is anything wrong with the amendment of my friend and colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], it lies in the fact that the cut proposed is not deep enough. If it were left for me to do, I would probably lay the ax a great deal deeper. I do not apologize to anyone for being an economizer. At the moment I am greatly interested in the solvency and the fiscal solidarity of this Government in the years ahead, when the unobligated and unexpended balances shall have been exhausted. Then will come this additional charge upon the Federal Treasury. With a softening of business, that can only mean that the deficit in succeeding fiscal years will be larger than the estimated deficit in the fiscal year 1953.

I think the Senate ought to be advised as to what is authorized by the bill. First of all, it authorizes \$600,000,000 for the fiscal year 1954-55. It makes \$50,000,000 available for bridges and tunnels in each of 2 years. It makes \$25,000,000 available for forest highways in each of 2 fiscal years. It makes available \$22,500,000 for each of two fiscal years for forest development roads. Then it includes \$10,000,000 for those 2 years for national park roads. It contains \$10,000,000 for parkways on United States-owned land, for each of 2 years. It contains \$10,000,000 more for roads on Indian reservations, for both fiscal years. It contains \$8,000,000 for every fiscal year from 1953 to 1959, inclusive, for the

Inter-American Highway. It contains another \$6,000,000 for Nicaragua, and \$15,000,000 for the emergency fund. It includes \$2,500,000 for surveys on unserved and Indian lands for each of 2 years; and finally, \$50,000,000 for defense highways.

So, in sum, what is in the bill is \$73,000,000 for the fiscal year 1953, \$738,000,000 for the fiscal year 1954, a like amount for the fiscal year 1955, and another \$8,000,000 for each of the four succeeding fiscal years. So what we are authorizing here today is \$1,581,000,000 from the fiscal year 1953 to and inclusive of the fiscal year 1959.

Mr. President, when I was a Member of the other body I served on the Independent Offices Subcommittee, which dealt with the subject of public roads. Appropriations for forest highways and development roads were formerly considered in connection with the agricultural appropriation bill. So this argument is not new to me. I have been living with it for a great many years.

I make the point that this road program is progressive. It cannot be completed in a single year or in a number of years. Highways are never going to be wide enough, especially when there is a "nut" behind the wheel who may have a certain content of alcohol in him. They are never going to be smooth enough for some people. So it is a progressive job which must go on and on and on. The question now is, How much should we authorize for any given fiscal year, in view of the present state of the budget?

I wish to emphasize as best I can that when all the unexpended and unobligated balances which are reported from time to time in connection with first one appropriation bill and then another are finally exhausted, it will become necessary for Congress to deal with these authorizations in the years ahead. Appropriations are likely to be larger and larger. Revenues may not keep pace. Then we shall be confronted with a very substantial budget deficit indeed, which may impair the confidence of the country.

I will not commit myself to that kind of program. If there is so much uncertainty and so much fever in the air as has been recited on the floor of the Senate from time to time, then it is incumbent upon the Congress to be rather restrained and inhibited in the extent of the commitments it makes for the years ahead.

So because of the uncertainty, and because of the charge upon the public purse which is involved, I shall go along with the amendment. My only regret is that the cut is not more substantial. The amount should be cut back to an even greater degree.

Not so many years ago we were appropriating for roads only \$150,000,000 a year, and there was constantly the same argument. The interesting thing with regard to the safety factor, which is frequently discussed, is that the more stop-and-go lights, the more divided highways, the more traffic officers, and the more safety devices, the larger is the weekend and holiday toll. I suppose it is one of those inescapable things, but it does mean, of course, that constantly we

must work toward the elimination of the factors which take a toll upon the highways and city streets, and constitute such a shame and scandal to a civilization which boasts of so much enlightenment. Probably some of it is inescapable, particularly so when we consider that the greatest safety factor is not the stop-and-go signs, but the alertness and mentality of the person who is behind the wheel. I have said over and over again that perhaps it is in the field of discipline, which must encompass the discipline of man, woman, and child, whether it be an aged person peering over bifocals walking across the street, or whether it be an impetuous child running into the street to retrieve a baseball, that we will finally get results and cut down this astonishing and cruel toll.

But here we have quite another thing, Mr. President. I think as never before—and I share this sentiment with my colleague—we simply cannot constantly go forth on the hustings and make political speeches and direct the attention of our people to the fact that there must be economy in government, and we cannot give constant assurances to people who are inveighing against Congress and rebuking it on both sides of the Capitol for its failure to balance the budget, without making at least a constructive endeavor in that field.

I do not wish to be found wanting in whatever modest endeavor I can make. Therefore, I shall support the amendment offered by my colleague from Illinois, and I once more confess my disappointment that the proposed cut is not larger.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am astounded at my own moderation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, according to the facts stated by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and as shown on page 3 of the report, the Federal Government had, in round figures, an income of \$700,000,000 a year from the gasoline tax during fiscal 1951, and an income of an additional \$1,000,000,000, in round figures, from Federal taxes on automobiles, tires, and parts. For fiscal 1952, the gasoline tax has been increased by one-third. Therefore, henceforth the annual figure, instead of being \$1,700,000,000, will be close to \$2,000,000,000.

That fact and one additional fact are very significant. They are what convince me that we would be playing the part of the ostrich if we ran from the necessities of our highways at the present time. More than 50,000,000 motor vehicles are using our highways. The testimony shows that the highways are wearing out. With respect to primary highways and superhighways they are not keeping up with the demand of current use and abuse and the wear-out rate. Those circumstances, as I see the matter, compel us to set the figures at some point near the demand of traffic, especially in view of the fact that this is an item which pays its way by more than 2 to 1 under the new figures.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not unmindful of the revenues which are derived from the sources mentioned and of the desire to put them back into the highways. However, I do not subscribe to the theory that there is even a moral obligation to do so, for if we take that approach, then the tax on furs should be put into more minks, and so forth.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not lay that down as a formula.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand. The other point is that from now until doomsday highways will never be wide enough and they will never be smooth enough, in the judgment of many people, to take care of the traffic needs. They will crumble under heavy loads. If we carry out that argument logically, then we should authorize not \$1,500,000,000 for respective fiscal years, but \$5,000,000,000; or let us make it \$10,000,000,000. Let us be unmindful of the needs of the budget, and do the job according to the estimates which have been set forth on the Senate floor.

Why stop with \$600,000,000 in fiscal 1954 for highways? Let us make it three or four times as much. That will mean so many more jobs, and so many more miles of highways. I am thinking in terms of the charge that is put upon the Treasury, which is money that must be extracted from the pockets of the people who are already overburdened with taxes.

Mr. STENNIS. It is not merely a matter of logic; it is a matter of the demands of the highways of the Nation. Our economy moves on wheels. A great number of those wheels are automobile wheels which use the highways day and night. We must meet the absolute demands of that traffic.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention also to the proposed change in the formula of distribution, as proposed by the Senator from Illinois in his amendment. I have been among those who have tried to keep up with the needs of and, in part, to look out for the secondary highway system. But I have willingly yielded to the facts and the demands of the times, and have gone along cheerfully with the program for interstate highways, which are superprimary highways. That system is needed. The traffic demands it. The money must be forthcoming. Frankly I think that \$50,000,000 is merely a start.

However, I strongly protest—and find no basis for it whatever in the facts—changing the formula of distribution among primary, secondary, and urban highways. The primary highways get 45 percent of the funds, and the urban highways get 25 percent. Therefore, 70 percent of the total amount goes to what we may call primary highways through-out.

In addition, a new formula is proposed for the secondary highways. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would make an inroad into the historic formula with respect to the small amount that goes to secondary highways. They cannot be classed as feeder roads, as local roads, or even as rural roads. They are highways which

are carrying an increasing proportion of the Nation's traffic, because many of the trucks and automobiles have already started going by what is called the back way, in order to keep off the primary highways.

This amendment strikes at a very vital factor in our highway legislation. It affects a formula which is based on testimony and on practical experience. Every time that formula has been before either House of Congress it has been affirmed. I submit in all seriousness that we should not strike down the formula by an amendment offered to the bill after the bill reaches the floor of the Senate, or vote a material change in the formula. I think it would be, as a practical matter, the beginning of a serious inroad into the so-called secondary-road formula, most of which applies to roads that could be classified as primary roads.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I gladly yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I have noticed with interest the Senator's suggestion that the bill now pending was constructed from what the committee thought was competent and informed testimony.

Mr. STENNIS. Very much so.

Mr. CAIN. Given by very practical highway people. My question, sir, is: Is it not a fact that the Public Works Committee studied the considered testimony offered to the committee by the American Association of State Highway Officials?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAIN. In other words, those gentlemen came from several States of the Union to appear before the committee and to offer their best advice as to the character of the bill which should be considered by the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

There is a further fact in regard to this formula. The bill as introduced contained a provision for the switching of funds as between the primary, secondary, and urban roads. The subcommittee expressly considered that provision. I am not a member of the subcommittee; but I know that, after consideration, the subcommittee recommended striking from the bill the provision which would permit any switching of the funds, and the full committee affirmed the recommendation of the subcommittee regarding that matter.

This morning the Senate already has adopted an amendment which strikes from the bill the provision in regard to the switching of these funds. If at this time we were to adopt an amendment which would be contradictory of that formula, we would be reversing the action the Senate took only a short time ago.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNING in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. Along the line of the remarks of the Senator from Washington,

who spoke of the State Highway Officials Association, I ask the Senator from Mississippi, is it not true, that last year, in order to obtain the grass-roots thinking in regard to the amount of money which should be appropriated for highways, a letter was addressed to the Governor of every State of the Union, and in that letter the opinion of each Governor was requested on the subject of whether there should be a decrease in appropriations for highways? Every Governor responded to the letter; and every Governor said, in effect, "It is absolutely the minimum amount that should be appropriated." Approximately half the Governors requested that the amount be increased. So we have from the grass-roots, from the highway officials of each State, and from the Governors of each State, statements to the effect that they do need the amount of money which has been requested, in order properly to maintain their highways.

Mr. STENNIS. I certainly appreciate the contribution the Senator has made to the facts, for the facts are what the Senate is interested in.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi permit me to add an observation to what the Senator from Wyoming has just said?

Mr. STENNIS. Certainly.

Mr. CAIN. I do not seek to embarrass the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], of course, nor do I question his sincerity in any respect whatsoever. On the other hand, with reference to the formula we are now discussing, is it not a fact that the State highway officials of the State of Illinois appeared either in person or submitted statements in writing, before the Public Works Committee, and strongly encouraged the adoption of the formula which the Senator from Illinois now seeks to have the Senate change? I would very much appreciate having the Senator indicate whether that is a fact, as my recollection tells me it is.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the committee, may answer the question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, these are the facts: Representatives of the American Association of State Highway Officials—only highway officials, not other types of officials—appeared before the committee. I know that highway officials from the State of Illinois and from every other State of the Union belong to the Association of State Highway Officials. The officers who represented that association represented officially the highway officials of every State of the Union.

Mr. CAIN. In order that I may be absolutely clear in my own mind, I have one more question: Did the Senate Committee on Public Works at any time receive any testimony from any State highway official of the State of Illinois or from any other official within the State of Illinois who said that he wished to

disregard or change or eliminate the formula which the Public Works Committee adopted?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only did they not insist that the formula be changed, but they recommended that the amount of the authorization be increased. As a matter of fact, they recommended a larger authorization than the committee reported.

Mr. CAIN. Then, it is fair to say, is it not, that the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] may be correct; but if he is, he is the only one who is correct, and the rest of us are wrong?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for a further moment?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. On page 77 of the committee hearings there appears a "National Policy Statement of the American Association of State Highway Officials Relating to New Federal-Aid Legislation for Highways, As Approved at a Meeting of the Chief Administrative Officers of the Association, Convening at Chicago, Ill., on November 27, 1951." They did not recommend changing the formula, but they did recommend the following:

Interstate, \$210,000,000.
Primary, \$270,000,000.
Secondary, \$180,000,000.
Urban, \$150,000,000.

Or a total of \$810,000,000, which is \$210,000,000 more than the recommendation made by the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, after making one more point, I shall yield the floor.

I have no criticism of the Senator from Illinois; I think he renders a very fine service. But it should be pointed out that whatever he states in regard to the top figure is a statement of opinion by him, and by him only. So I wish to warn the Senate that it would be taking a wrong and a dangerous step if it adopted the figure the author of this amendment took from the budget estimates, and then split the difference between that figure and the amount already carried in the law.

If the Senator from Illinois wishes to follow the Bureau of the Budget, he can offer an amendment to strike out the item of \$75,000,000 for the interstate highways. That will be a good test, because the Budget Bureau did not make any recommendation on that item.

But it is a most serious matter to alter the formula, unless the alteration is based upon facts and an analysis of the facts which reach into the real ramifications of the problem.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Would not the adoption of the amendment against which the distinguished Senator has just spoken be a very heavy blow to farm-to-market roads?

Mr. STENNIS. It certainly would, and it would also be a very heavy blow to secondary roads and highways.

Mr. KERR. Including all federally aided farm-to-market roads?

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct—including the farm-to-market roads, and also including the secondary highways which carry a great part of the burden of the traffic in the United States.

Mr. President, I now yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hendrickson	Moody
Anderson	Hennings	Morse
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Hill	Nixon
Byrd	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Cain	Holland	Pastore
Capehart	Hunt	Robertson
Carlson	Ives	Saltonstall
Chavez	Jenner	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Seaton
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Lehman	Stennis
Dworshak	Long	Taft
Eastland	Martin	Thye
Ellender	Maybank	Tobey
Ferguson	McCarran	Underwood
Flanders	McCarthy	Welker
Fulbright	McClellan	Wiley
George	McFarland	Williams
Gillette	McKellar	Young
Green	Millikin	
Hayden	Monroney	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. DOUGLAS and other Senators demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

I announce also that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 37, as follows:

YEAS—33

Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Schoeppel
Byrd	Ives	Seaton
Capehart	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	McCarthy	Taft
Douglas	Moody	Tobey
Dworshak	Morse	Welker
Ferguson	Mundt	Wiley
Flanders	Nixon	Williams
Hendrickson	Robertson	Young

NAYS—37

Aiken	Hayden	McClellan
Anderson	Hennings	McFarland
Cain	Hill	McKellar
Chavez	Holland	Millikin
Clements	Hunt	Monroney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Eastland	Kerr	Smathers
Ellender	Kilgore	Stennis
Fulbright	Lehman	Thye
George	Long	Underwood
Gillette	Maybank	
Green	McCarran	

NOT VOTING—26

Bennett	Humphrey	McMahon
Benton	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Brewster	Kefauver	Neely
Bricker	Kem	O'Conor
Butler, Nebr.	Knowland	Russell
Case	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Lodge	Sparkman
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins
Frear	Malone	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that that motion be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, June 3, 1952, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1342. An act to amend acts relating to garagekeepers' and liverymen's liens and the enforcement thereof in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 2786. An act to amend section 106 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1855. An act for the relief of Joachim Volk, also known as Steyen Craig Delano;

S. 1953. An act for the relief of Midori Sugimoto;

S. 2089. An act for the relief of Debra Elaine Evans;

S. 2462. An act for the relief of Teruo Uechi;

S. 2554. An act for the relief of Eugene Richard Sushko;

S. 2571. An act for the relief of Ernest Daniel Davis, Jr.;

S. 2593. An act for the relief of Jean Hamamoto, also known as Sharon Lea Brooks;

S. 2643. An act for the relief of Kathleen Cowley;

S. 2768. An act for the relief of Barbara Ann Sheppard; and

S. 2805. An act for the relief of Susan Jeanne Kerr.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1828) to confirm the status of certain civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities under the Armed Forces with respect to laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4241. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims with respect to claims against the United States of certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice;

H. R. 5218. An act for improvement of the Mississippi River-Gulf outlet and the Mobile to New Orleans Intracoastal Waterway;

H. R. 6129. An act to provide for the transfer of certain lands and interests in lands at Mill Rock Island in the East River, N. Y.;

H. R. 6500. An act to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder;

H. R. 6578. An act to provide for correlation and coordination of research into practical means for the economical production, from sea or other saline waters, of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6856. An act to extend the duration of the Water Pollution Control Act;

H. R. 7202. An act to amend section 16 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the fifteenth and subsequent decennial censuses and to provide for apportionment of Representatives in Congress," approved June 18, 1929 (46 Stat. 25; 13 U. S. C. 216);

H. R. 7471. An act to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the mail equipment shops in Washington, D. C., and for other purposes;

H. R. 7573. An act to provide for the conveyance to the State of Indiana of certain surplus real property situated in Marion County, Ind.;

H. R. 7641. An act to provide benefits for certain Federal employees of Japanese an-

cestry who lost certain rights with respect to grade, time in grade, and rate of compensation by reason of any policy or program of the Federal Government with respect to persons of Japanese ancestry during World War II;

H. R. 7714. An act to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7806. An act to authorize the participation by certain Federal employees, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the Armed Forces returned to the United States from abroad for burial; and

H. J. Res. 449. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Dr. Vannevar Bush as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

REPORT OF GOVERNOR OF PANAMA CANAL—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the annual report of the Governor of the Panama Canal for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 3, 1952.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

INCOME TAX AND REFORESTATION—RESOLUTION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Kentucky-Tennessee section of the Society of American Foresters, suggesting one of the several steps needed to accelerate the present rate of reforestation.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas reforestation in the area of the Kentucky-Tennessee section is proceeding at a pace under which it will take many decades to complete the needed reforestation; and

Whereas, as a consequence, large acreages of land capable of producing timber and national wealth now lie idle and unproductive; and

Whereas it is believed good Government policy to place such land in forest production at a more rapid rate; and

Whereas it is believed that this may be partially accomplished by adjustments in income tax procedures in a manner which should prove beneficial to long term income tax returns to the Federal Government: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That (1) the Kentucky-Tennessee section in meeting assembled requests the council of the SAF to seriously consider proposing legislation to the Eighty-second Congress looking toward the adjustment of

the income tax regulations, to provide that costs of tree planting may be treated either as a capital expense to be added to the depletion base or as an operating expense at the option of the taxpayer. (2) Copies of this resolution be forwarded to each Senator and Congressman representing the area covered by the Kentucky-Tennessee section for their information.

OVERPOPULATION OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES—RESOLUTION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which was adopted at a meeting of 13 nationality, social, fraternal, and religious groups in my State of Wisconsin.

The subject of the resolution is the pending legislation dealing with the possible relief of European overpopulation.

We, on the Senate Judiciary Committee, have urged that there be a thorough study of this vital issue.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and thereafter appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Representatives of 13 nationality, social, fraternal, and religious groups in Milwaukee, Wis., met to discuss current legislation on special migration, and resolved to support House bill 7376 in principle, as an indication of American interest in the overpopulated areas in Europe, and also to continue the precedent of American foresight for concern of the needy and oppressed in Europe.

The desire was expressed by this group that if possible, priorities for immigration should be given to refugees from any Communist-dominated area of Europe.

Therefore, in conclusion, we as individuals active in 13 nationality, social, fraternal, and religious groups in Milwaukee, wholeheartedly approve of House bill 7376, move and urge for the passage of this bill.

REV. GEORGE THOMAS,
JOSEPH MIKULA,
PETER SHANE,
JAMES T. HELIOS,
WILLETT C. PIERCE,
Resolutions Committee.

GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—LETTERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly consider, I trust, the long delayed issue of the final vote on Senate Joint Resolution 27, for the completion of the St. Lawrence seaway.

At this time, I send to the desk an excellent letter received this morning from the legislative counsel of the National Grange. I particularly invite the attention of my colleagues to J. T. Sanders' able comments on the self-liquidation amendment which we have cosponsored to the bill in order to reduce to a minimum any possible burden on the Federal Treasury, even on a temporary basis.

It has also been my pleasure to correspond with the distinguished president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, Allan B. Kline, on the subject of the self-liquidation amendment. We of Wisconsin are proud of our Wisconsin Federation, and of the great support

which it and other farm bureaus all over the Nation have always given to the seaway. Mr. Kline has kindly and as usual, promptly acknowledged my note and has indicated that a detailed reply will be forthcoming. At this time, I send to the desk the letter from Mr. Sanders, and the letter which I in turn conveyed to Mr. Kline. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL GRANGE,

Washington, D. C., June 2, 1952.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: The St. Lawrence seaway and power project will soon come before you for a favorable or adverse decision. For nearly a quarter of a century, 23 years to be exact, the National Grange has been in favor of developing this great project. Throughout this period of support, I believe, an accurate analysis of why we have been continuously in favor would doubtless reveal three reasons, as follows: (a) That its completion would decidedly promote the national welfare; (b) that it is economically sound and, as a corollary, more recently is set up as a self-liquidating, self-financing project; (c) that even its opponents who are motivated by imaginary self-interest, we believe, will ultimately receive net gains from the project.

Besides these long-time more basic reasons in favor of this project, we believe there are some recent situations that constitute strong reasons why delay in this project is pointless and unjustified, as follows:

(1) Canada, impatient at our unjustified delay, now proposes to go ahead and build the project without us, but Canada will not develop the project to give expanded service west of Toledo, Ohio.

(2) If Canada builds the project alone, she necessarily can and will charge American shippers and users for all services we get from it—we, in the end, will lose all control and probably pay a far bigger bill.

(3) The proposed Aiken-Douglas-Taft amendment, even overcomes the groundless excuse that expanded Federal expenditures at this time should be avoided. This amendment will provide for use of private capital and puts this project clearly in the investment category. It also does away with the unbalanced budget inflationary claims of opponents.

With this array of logic before the Senate, it is indeed difficult for us to see how the Senate can now fail to approve this project for the earliest possible construction.

We sincerely hope you will agree with us and will use all your influence for earliest favorable action.

Very sincerely yours,

J. T. SANDERS,
Legislative Counsel.

MAY 21, LETTER FROM SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, CO-SPONSOR OF SEAWAY BILL AND OF SELF-FINANCING AMENDMENT, TO ALLAN KLINE, PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION, TO URGE NO MAJOR CHANGES IN SELF-LIQUIDATION PROPOSAL

DEAR MR. KLINE: I am writing to you in order to present a few reactions to the letter of April 10th which you sent to Chairman CONNALLY of the Foreign Relations Committee and which he subsequently reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 1.

The time is short.

Write or telegraph the White House immediately, telling the President you want this law stopped.

VILLAGE LAGUARDIA CLUB,
AMERICAN LABOR PARTY.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

CONTINUATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT, 1916

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2437) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (3 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk my amendment F, and ask that it be read and made the pending question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "\$600,000,-000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$500,000,000."

On page 2, line 3, strike out "\$270,000,-000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$225,000,000."

On page 2, line 5, strike out "\$180,000,-000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$150,000,000."

On page 2, line 7, strike out "\$150,000,-000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$125,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I can state in 1 minute what this amendment is. The previous amendment proposed a cut of \$200,000,000. The pending amendment proposes a cut of only \$100,000,000, from \$600,000,000 to \$500,000,000. Furthermore, it does not alter the existing ratio of distribution provided by the Federal-aid statute, retaining the formula of 45 percent, 30 percent, and 25 percent, respectively.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask the Senator a question in order to clarify the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator wish me to yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the amendment propose to continue the present authorization of the 1950 act?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh yes. It merely affects the authorizations for 1953-54 and 1954-55. It does not alter the previous authorization.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It keeps the authorization as it was in the 1950 act.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct—\$500,000,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I favor the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, and I wish to make a brief statement with reference to it.

First, the pending amendment does not make any change in the basis of distribution between primary aid, sec-

ondary aid, and urban assistance, and to that extent does not bring into the bill any of the implications which were involved in the previous amendment.

Second, this amendment is based not upon the budget, but upon a continuation of the present level of authorizations which have been followed under the current law, and which have been found by the States to be usable, though in some instances insufficient to meet the needs of the States.

I should be entirely willing to go along with the full amount covered by the bill, but for the necessity for economy, which I think, except in conditions which directly affect the defense situation, makes it unwise for us to increase expenditures under present conditions.

This amendment would follow both the basis of distribution and the amount of authorization contained in the present law. I do not want to leave that statement by itself, because it might create the impression that the total amount carried by the bill was the same as the amount under the present law, whereas that is not the case. The bill has an additional item of \$50,000,000 for the interstate system.

If Senators will read the report of the hearings they will find that the Defense Department made a very strong case for hurrying the work on the interstate system of highways, and made it very clear that the interstate system had to do directly with the defensive strength of our Nation. That subject is covered in some detail on page 33 of the committee hearings. It will be found also in various other places—and I refer to pages 10 and 11 and page 26 of the committee hearings—that not only the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army, but also the Bureau of Public Roads, made it quite clear that in their judgment the Nation was following an unwise course in not accentuating the early completion of the interstate system.

The interstate system comprises a mileage of not to exceed 40,000 miles of critical highways embraced within the primary aid system and the connecting urban links through the cities. The interstate highway system has not been completed. The worst bottlenecks to traffic are in the uncompleted portions of the interstate system.

So I feel that the Senate is justified, as I felt the committee was thoroughly justified, in placing in the bill a special item of \$50,000,000 for hastening the completion of the interstate system.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

If the amendment now pending is adopted, it will continue the present levels of construction with respect to primary, secondary, and urban assistance, as enlarged by the \$50,000,000 which is in another section of the bill, and which has already been approved by the Senate. The total increase involved in the bill for the Federal-aid system to the interstate highway in general is \$50,000,000 a year for each of the 2 years covered by the program. I dis-

like to see any increase, but I believe that in view of all the testimony before the subcommittee, which testimony was discussed in the full committee, it is quite clear that the Nation is defensively weak by reason of the present state of incompletion of the interstate system of highways. For that reason I think the committee is wholly justified in recommending the increase.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi did not understand clearly. As I understand, this amendment does not affect the \$50,000,000 which is provided by the bill expressly for the super-primary system.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The only reason the Senator from Florida mentioned that item is that, whereas he has just said that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would continue the present level of authorizations and expenditures, he wanted to make it clear that the other amendment in the bill, relating to the interstate system, in the amount of \$50,000,000 a year, is above the level of the present authorizations and expenditures. The Senator from Florida thinks that is justified, and he wished so to state on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Florida was chairman of the subcommittee which considered the bill and conducted the hearings. The full committee decided to make the amount \$600,000,000, because the full committee felt that, because of the high cost of materials nowadays, at least \$100,000,000 more would be required than would have been required 2 years ago for the construction of roads. It was not with the idea of merely appropriating an additional \$100,000,000. There is no question that the Senator from Illinois is well acquainted with what developed at the hearings. I will accept his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, have not the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

I think we should proceed with the yeas and nays.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Illinois, notwithstanding the fact that State-highway officials are not with him. I shall vote for his amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had not quite completed my remarks. One further statement and I shall be through.

This amendment would leave the entire amount of the bill for each year for the regular subjects, the primary, secondary, urban, and interstate systems, at exactly the same amount as the \$550,000,000 included in House bill 7340, which is on the desks of Senators. In other words, very little would be left for consideration in the conference. Such ac-

tion would indicate an expression by the Senate very close to the expression already made by the House of Representatives.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, to make the figure \$450,000,000 instead of \$500,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. The yeas and nays have already been ordered on the original amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Are we now voting on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the original amendment of the Senator from Illinois?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have. This vote is on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting,

the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

I announce also that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—33

Bridges	Hoey	Robertson
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Saltonstall
Byrd	Ives	Schoeppel
Capehart	Jenner	Seaton
Dirksen	Martin	Smith, Maine
Douglas	McCarthy	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Moody	Taft
Ferguson	Morse	Welker
Flanders	Mundt	Wiley
Hendrickson	Nixon	Williams
Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney	Young

NAYS—36

Aiken	Green	McCarran
Anderson	Hayden	McClellan
Cain	Hennings	McFarland
Chavez	Hill	McKellar
Clements	Holland	Millikin
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Eastland	Kerr	Smathers
Ellender	Kilgore	Stennis
Fulbright	Lehman	Thye
George	Long	Tobey
Gillette	Maybank	Underwood

NOT VOTING—27

Bennett	Frear	Malone
Benton	Humphrey	McMahon
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Bricker	Kefauver	Neely
Butler, Nebr.	Kem	O'Connor
Carlson	Knowland	Russell
Case	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Lodge	Sparkman
Ecton	Magnuson	Watkins

So Mr. BRIDGES' amendment to Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order to save time, why can not we dispense with a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a number of Senators who have voted against previous cuts have expressed to me their desire to vote for a cut of \$100,000,000. I think they should be given an opportunity to go on record. I must insist on a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

I announce also that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator

from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS]. If present and voting the Senator from Maine would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR]. If present and voting the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay" and the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—54

Alken	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Anderson	Hoey	Nixon
Bridges	Holland	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	Hunt	Robertson
Byrd	Ives	Saltonstall
Capehart	Jenner	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnson, Tex.	Seaton
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Dworshak	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Long	Stennis
Ferguson	Martin	Taft
Flanders	Maybank	Thye
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tobey
George	McClellan	Welker
Gillette	Millikin	Wiley
Hendrickson	Moody	Williams
Hennings	Morse	Young

NAYS—14

Cain	Hayden	McKellar
Chavez	Hill	Monroney
Clements	Kerr	Pastore
Ellender	McCarran	Underwood
Green	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—28

Bennett	Frear	McMahon
Benton	Humphrey	Murray
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Bricker	Kefauver	O'Connor
Butler, Nebr.	Kem	Russell
Carlson	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Case	Langer	Sparkman
Connally	Lodge	Watkins
Duff	Magnuson	
Eaton	Malone	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read by the clerk, for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, in line 13, following the colon, it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction; and be it further."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, this amendment has been discussed with and accepted by the chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

The amendment speaks for itself. It merely makes certain that an appropriate Federal agency shall not construct or reconstruct timber-access roads unless it has available the considered views of the responsible persons who live in the area where the road is to be constructed.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me, to permit me to submit an amendment identical to the one just agreed to? The amendment to which I now refer properly belongs in another place in the bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well; I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment and send it to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment heretofore agreed to on page 11, in line 25, it is proposed to strike out the period, and to insert the following: "And be it further provided, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road under the authority contained in this section, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction."

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, for the reasons previously stated, I urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. DWORSHAK. It has been my experience that in attempting to obtain allocations of funds under the Federal highway program for timber-access roads, for which the Department of Agriculture has the responsibility of asking for priorities, invariably there has been a delay which has resulted in the exhaustion of all the funds prior to obtaining any allocation for specific timber-access-road projects.

I wonder whether the proceedings contemplated by the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington may not cause delay to such an extent that all the funds will be completely exhausted before the Bureau of Public Roads will be able to take any action on a specific timber-access-road project?

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Idaho is wrong, because of the fact that the bill provides that not less than \$5,000,000 shall be used for the construction and reconstruction of timber-access roads. The amendment which has just been adopted will permit both the large and the small timber operators to present their views as responsible persons to the appropriate and responsible Federal agencies.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield further to me?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly, sir.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am fully aware of that fact, because I suggested that particular amendment in the Public Works Committee, and it was graciously accepted by the chairman and the other members.

However, the amendment just offered by the Senator from Washington, on page 11, deals specifically with the access-road fund, and has nothing to do with the forest roads and trails fund, which is supervised by the Forest Service. Can the Senator from Washington explain that situation?

Mr. CAIN. I think so. My answer to the Senator's question is, I believe that caution, care, patience, and intelligence should be exercised before any timber-access road, long or short, wide or narrow, should be constructed or reconstructed. If a reluctance on the part of the Federal agency to conduct the public hearings as provided by the amendment just offered by the Senator from Washington were to develop, I take it to be obvious that the Public Works Committee in its next bill would recommend an appropriate and adequate remedy to overcome such reluctance.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. If the \$50,000,000 fund provided on page 11, in section 10, were to be completely exhausted before any reports could be made or hearings held relative to a timber-access road, would not the Senator's amendment prove ineffective by virtue of the fact that no funds would be available at that time?

Mr. CAIN. I hardly believe the Senator's fear would materialize. But, by way of argument, I shall continue to believe most sincerely that no timber-access road, or, in fact, any other road of any character, should be constructed or reconstructed without every effort being made to learn the full facts as to what was to be done, before undertaking the project. I think this amendment would afford a maximum of insurance and guaranty in that matter.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it the Senator's position that his amendment would make it easier, or that it would make it more difficult to provide adequate fire-protection roads and other roads through the forests?

Mr. CAIN. It should make it neither more difficult nor easier to get a particular road constructed. It should make certain that a road to be constructed would be strategically, economically, and advantageously located.

Mr. MUNDT. Is the Senator entirely satisfied that it would not create circumstances of red tape and confusion which would delay the construction of desirable roads?

Mr. CAIN. I think in a good many instances it would speed up construction, because the public hearing would result in a more rapid decision. The public hearing would dissipate uncertainty, dissension, and argument. The probability is—and we hope it will be the case—that the public hearing will result in a complete and total agreement on the part of all parties concerned, and that the public interest will be better conserved, as a result.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator. I merely did not want to see added to the bill a provision which might create endless delay in the construction of roads which are very essential.

Mr. CAIN. It is my considered view that such a sad result would not ensue. I say to my friend, the Senator from South Dakota, that if there should be any such result—and it would naturally be brought to the attention of the Senator from Washington—I would most gladly go to the Public Works Committee, first, to point out that a mistake had been made, and I would follow that by asking the Senate to repeal the amendment. However, I think there is no likelihood of the happening of such a contingency as that which the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. As a result of his experience, does the Senator from Washington believe that public hearings sometimes develop more heat than light?

Mr. CAIN. Occasionally they do, but generally speaking, I believe that much better and more constructive results are obtained when members of the general public are permitted to present their views, than is the case otherwise.

Mr. TOBEY. That is the hope, in accordance with the maxim, "vox populi, vox Dei," is it not?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, we are spending money which belongs to the taxpayers of the United States, and, in my view, the taxpayers should be permitted an opportunity to discuss the situation.

Mr. TOBEY. "Vox populi, vox Dei." The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the committee amendment on page 11, in section 10, was agreed to, is reconsidered. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move to amend the bill, on page 11, line 12, by

striking out section 10. The amendment would provide a saving of approximately \$50,000,000, in the amount authorized by the bill, a saving on an item which is not now imperative.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, inasmuch as section 10 has already been adopted as a committee amendment, is the Senator from New Hampshire in order at this time in submitting his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment having been agreed to, an amendment to it is not in order unless it is reconsidered, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the point of order having been made, it is obvious that unanimous consent could not be obtained. Therefore I desire to make another motion. I move that on page 11, section 10 of the bill, in lines 16 and 17, the numerals "\$50,000,000" be stricken out and "\$10,000,000" inserted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the committee amendment is not again open to amendment at this stage. The Chair must therefore rule the Senator from New Hampshire out of order.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may I inquire the basis upon which the Chair rules me out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After an amendment, as amended, has been agreed to, a further amendment is not in order unless the previous vote has been reconsidered. There was a previous motion to reconsider the vote agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Chair has referred to a previous motion. May I inquire what that motion was?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that a motion to reconsider the committee amendment, as amended, is in order. The previous motion was to consider the vote agreeing only to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then, Mr. President, I submit that my amendment is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be necessary first to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to, as a preliminary to the submission of the Senator's second amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. The second amendment would be in order, would it not, if its sole purpose were to affect a figure in the amendment which has now become a part of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that it would be in order, if a motion to reconsider the committee amendment, as amended, were agreed to, which would require a majority vote.

Mr. BRIDGES. I assume the correctness of the ruling of the distinguished

occupant of the chair, by and with the advice of the Parliamentarian, but I did not realize that when the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to, we would be precluded from changing a figure in the amendment so adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that in order to get this question before the Senate, it will be necessary for the distinguished minority floor leader to move to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. I so move.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope the distinguished Senator will reexamine this matter and not insist upon his motion. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator that, serving as chairman of the subcommittee, I felt it would have been wise to have an entirely separate bill with reference to the defense access highway authorization, but so much time elapsed between the time of the hearing in February and the time when the bill was ready to be considered by the full committee, that it was quite obvious we might have no access highway authorization at all. We were told by the Department of Defense and by the Atomic Energy Commission and others who were in charge of the defense program that the \$45,000,000, which was the total amount authorized last year, had been exhausted and that the construction of certain projects was so completely necessary that, instead of not having any legislation at all, the committee should consider some amount, even though it was insufficient, to see the matter through the whole year.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that in the beginning the Defense Department asked for \$150,000,000, and the committee, considering the testimony before it, felt it was quite clear that more than \$50,000,000 would be required in the course of the fiscal year, and therefore put into the bill an amendment containing the \$50,000,000 figure. I was very sure that amount would prove to be inadequate for the defense access highway construction which would be needed during the year.

The bill covers a great multitude of roads, such as access roads to new atomic energy bases, with some 24 access roads in one State to and from uranium mines. There are other roads to submarginal mining operations which are very necessary in the defense effort.

I hope the Senator will feel that he is justified in not pressing his motion, because I shall certainly have to oppose it very vigorously. I believe the \$50,000,000 is considerably less than the amount which will be needed.

I make that statement at this time for the information of the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I, too, should like to tell the Senator from New Hampshire that the testimony which was adduced by the committee is to the effect

that, as a matter of fact, three or four times the amount the committee allowed could be used. The committee has had experience with access road funds on several occasions. Two years ago, when the Senate was meeting in the old Supreme Court Chamber and the road bill was under consideration, the committee recommended \$25,000,000 for access roads. A letter came from the executive branch of the Government suggesting cutting the amount to \$10,000,000. It was not 40 days until the Korean situation developed, and then Congress had again to authorize the appropriation. Money will be needed in case of emergency. As to most of it, suggestions were made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, I should like to refer him to page 11 of the committee hearing, and to a portion of the report on this very subject, which the Department of the Army submitted to our committee. In that report the Senator will find that at the time of the report, on February 19, the items already certified by the Secretary of Defense to the Secretary of Commerce amounted to \$18,000,000, and that by June 30, 1952, it was believed the amount would be \$40,000,000. Of course the Defense Department does not have jurisdiction of such matters as forest-access roads, atomic-energy roads, and other roads of that kind.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the last paragraph on page 11 of the hearings, which is an excerpt taken from the report of the Department of Defense, addressed to Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ, chairman of the Committee on Public Works of the Senate, under date of February 19, 1952.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The estimated cost of access road projects which have been certified to the Secretary of Commerce by the Secretary of Defense is approximately \$18,000,000. More projects have not been acted upon only because of the difficulties in obtaining qualified personnel and making the necessary administrative adjustments for handling the increased workload connected with this access-road program and other highways for national defense and highway utilization problems which have arisen since the enactment of Public Law 177, Eighty-second Congress on October 16, 1951. It is believed that these difficulties have now been overcome in large part. Accordingly, it is estimated that the Department of Defense certifications to the Secretary of Commerce will be current by June 30, 1952, and that all projects certified by that date will cost approximately 40,000,000. While there is no known way to determine accurately the amount of funds that will be required for access roads, it is believed that the appropriation of \$150,000,000 authorized by section 9 of the bill will ade-

quately provide for this requirement in the foreseeable future. Subject to the amendment indicated above the Department of Defense favors section 9.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I desire at this time to supply some background for a proposed amendment by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and myself to the Defense Production Act, S. 2594, relating to section 104 of the present act. The situation I am about to describe has had very little attention heretofore and deserves, in my opinion, very careful consideration.

First of all, the present Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, contains section 104 which provided import-control authority for fats and oils, including oil-bearing material, fatty acids, soap and soap powder, peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products.

It will be recalled that there has been considerable discussion of provisions of that amendment. I note that the Committee on Banking and Currency, in reporting out S. 2594, a bill to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, has seen fit to rewrite section 104 and that its new section 101 eliminates the mandatory provisions of section 104 with respect to action by the Secretary of Agriculture and the President in imposing quotas.

My distinguished colleague from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has proposed an amendment to continue section 104 in effect. He has agreed with me to the addition of four commodities seriously affected by developments in recent years. These commodities are rye, barley, oats, and feed wheat which are being brought into this country in increasing quantities. It is background with respect to these four that I wish to supply at this time.

My present purpose is not to discuss the relative merits of the old section 104 compared with the proposed new section 101 but to outline why the same kind of treatment should be given to oats, barley, rye, and feed wheat which was provided for dairy products, rice, peanuts, and fats and oils.

RYE

In the case of rye production, producers in the United States have become very discouraged.

I ask unanimous consent at this time to have placed in the RECORD with my remarks a table marked "Exhibit F," showing the harvested acreage of rye in the United States from 1931 through 1951 and the official Government estimate of the estimated acreage for harvest in 1952.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT F
Harvested acreage of rye, United States,
1931-52¹

Year:	Acreage (thousand acres)
1931.....	3,159
1932.....	3,350
1933.....	2,405
1934.....	1,921
1935.....	4,066
1936.....	2,694
1937.....	3,825
1938.....	4,087
1939.....	3,822
1940.....	3,204
1941.....	3,573
1942.....	3,792
1943.....	2,652
1944.....	2,132
1945.....	1,856
1946.....	1,607
1947.....	2,010
1948.....	2,096
1949.....	1,560
1950.....	1,730
1951.....	² 1,733
Estimated acreage for harvest: 1952.....	³ 1,381

¹Source: Crop Production, 1951 Annual Summary, Crop Reporting Board, U. S. Department of Agriculture, December 1951, p. 36.

²The 1950 acreage is revised on the basis of the 1950 Census of Agriculture and other check data.

³Source: May 9 Crop Report, U. S. Department of Agriculture, p. 1.

Mr. YOUNG. This table shows that in the 1930's, despite two serious droughts, United States farmers harvested an average of around 3,500,000 acres of rye annually. This fell off in the 1940's to something below 2,500,000 acres annually. The reduction has been rather consistent; and now for 1952, based on the May 9 crop report showing conditions on American farms as of May 1, we find this year the lowest prospective harvested acreage for more than 20 years. This year the May report estimates harvested acreage of rye at 1,381,000 acres.

Mr. President, I think that proves conclusively that as a result of vast imports of more cheaply produced rye, we are fast liquidating the rye industry of the United States.

It is possible that there will be further abandonment of acres because weather conditions have been somewhat adverse, particularly in my own State of North Dakota, and in South Dakota and Minnesota, which are important rye producing States.

Why has rye production fallen off? The answer is that imports, primarily from Canada, have increased substantially. These imports, while they are less than our domestic production, effectively determine the price of rye for our domestic producers.

Whereas in the 1922 and 1930 tariff acts there was an import duty on rye of 15 cents per 56-pound bushel, this has been reduced by negotiations carried on

by the State Department to a point where the duty on rye is now only 6 cents a bushel. Taking into account the lower production costs and lower transportation costs in Canada, this 6-cent tariff is at present no impediment to the importation of rye, and the decline in our domestic production indicates that producers, unless appropriate steps are taken, are being forced to surrender the opportunity of supplying our domestic needs.

It does not seem to me that it is practical, desirable, or consistent with the program of expanded production proposed by the United States Department of Agriculture and supported by Congress to ask farmers to increase their production of rye while at the same time permitting their prices to be determined largely by imports.

Under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended many times and as recently as 1948 and 1949, the clear legislative intent of Congress was to establish parity as the goal for farmers. However, parity will be increasingly unobtainable by farmers in the case of rye as long as very substantial imports come into this country. Indeed, the parity price for rye has been reduced 5 percent this year under transitional parity.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the Senator from North Dakota would tell the Senate whether, in his opinion, he agrees with the Senator from South Dakota that in permitting this kind of competition from Canadian rye, we are actually operating in direct opposition to the program relating to parity prices adopted by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, the House Committee on Agriculture, and the Congress, because it is impossible to maintain parity prices for American rye when, as rye goes up in the United States, there are expanding importations coming down from Canada.

Mr. YOUNG. I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. By permitting excessive imports of any given commodity, we destroy not only the price of the commodity, but also the whole intent of the agricultural adjustment program.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it not true also that, following such a ruinous tariff agricultural program in the instant case of rye, the only way we are going to be able to stimulate domestic rye production, the only way we are going to be able to give the farmer a parity price for rye, will be to provide a parity-price-support floor whereby the Government and the taxpayer would have to pay the American farmer for his rye? Not only that, but, under those circumstances, with rye coming in from Canada, we would also be putting a floor under the price of rye for the Canadian farmer as well as the American farmer.

Mr. YOUNG. That is exactly what we are doing at the present time. We are not only supporting the price of rye on behalf of farmers in the United States but, in effect, are supporting the price not only in Canada but also in other places in the world.

I might point out to the Senator from South Dakota that only a year or two ago, when we had potatoes running out of our ears, we were importing sizable quantities of potatoes from Canada. Those imports were largely responsible for the depressed price of potatoes and the heavy cost to the Government of the United States. Now, when we need those potatoes they have few to sell us. I think it is imperative that at all times we protect our own industry in the United States to insure future supplies, if nothing else.

Mr. MUNDT. Not only should we protect it, but if we do not we are driving a knife into the back of the whole agricultural program. What broke down the potato program was the importation of foreign potatoes, and we should learn something from that experience before we adopt a similar course in the field of rye, oats, and other grains.

Mr. YOUNG. I had intended to touch on the importation of oats a little later, but I think now is a good time to bring up a few figures on oats imports, since the Senator from South Dakota has mentioned oats.

Mr. MUNDT. I hope the Senator will bring out the fact that the price of oats is very seriously depressed in the Northwest today.

Mr. YOUNG. I certainly shall do so. According to the May 15 report of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, the average price for oats in North Dakota was 59 cents a bushel. The support price for the 1951 program, under which those oats were produced, was 65 cents a bushel. In other words, the price of oats is 6 cents a bushel lower than the price support level, which means that the Department of Agriculture will unnecessarily have to spend millions of dollars in support of oats, when all they would have to do to hold the price up to support levels, would be to shut off a part of the imports from Canada.

Mr. MUNDT. Under the provisions of our amendment, that will become mandatory, and the Department can do that.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct. I should point out, further, that the announced support price for oats in our area this year is 70 cents a bushel. That will make a spread of 11 cents a bushel between the support level and the cash price of oats, which means that the Government of the United States will be spending unnecessarily millions of dollars on the support price of oats. Such support would be unnecessary in this case if only we would cut off some of the imports.

Rye is not a basic commodity, but a price support and purchase agreement program has been offered by the United States Department of Agriculture at about 80 percent of transitional parity. It is now felt that a great deal of the rye produced even from our greatly reduced acreage of rye will this year find its way into the price-support program because the market prices are dominated by the imports of rye. This year these imports will amount to three million to four million bushels. They have been

higher still in other recent years. Many of us feel these imports are bound to be higher in the next several years because Canada is tending to expand its production of rye because of market opportunities here.

The United States Department of Agriculture and the President could, of course, invoke Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended. This section has as its purpose to complement and assist the Agricultural Adjustment Act by the imposition of quotas when necessary.

No step has been taken, to my knowledge, to investigate the effect and influence of imports on the production of rye or on the extent to which imports interfere with the Government's rye production programs, and there is presently in prospect no action by the Administration of which I am aware. Thus, the purpose of section 22 has been ignored despite its clear intent to protect and support our farm programs.

It is recalled that the first sentence of section 22, the import section of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, stated:

Whenever the President has reason to believe that any one or more articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in sufficient quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any commodity subject to and with respect to which any program is in operation, under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts.

Ordinarily, one would think the Secretary of Agriculture or the President of the United States would take action under present circumstances. But, as I pointed out, the President very rarely has used section 22, and it is for that reason I believe we must have mandatory provisions, such as are contained in section 104.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. If I recall correctly, section 22 has not been used since 1939 or 1940, for the purpose for which Congress intended it.

Mr. YOUNG. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. It has been used to reduce tariffs, but it has never been used to protect the American market or the American support program.

Mr. YOUNG. I thank the Senator from Vermont for his statement.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from North Dakota also realize it is barely possible that, if through outright failure to apply the law as intended by Congress, sufficient imports can be induced to come into this country, the price to the American farmer may be reduced to such a point that he would be willing to accept a Government check to help him

The Senator from North Dakota has submitted a chart which shows specifically what the tariff was in 1922 on oats, barley, and rye, and what the reduction in that tariff has been during the past 30 years since 1922. The reduction has been constant, down to 4 cents a bushel. The farm program has had to carry the burden of this reduced tariff rate.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Minnesota is absolutely correct. Price supports for many agricultural products would be impossible or at least tremendously costly, perhaps to the extent that they would be prohibitive, if we do not have a little protection against more cheaply produced products which come in from other countries.

I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota. He has not only made a great study of the whole subject of agriculture but is a very great friend of agriculture, as is the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

We do not know definitely at this time what the acreage of oats will be this year, but there is very considerable evidence that farmers have reduced acreage except in situations where they had no choice in their rotation programs.

There is a considerable quantity of surplus oats still remaining in Canada with a result that it is possible that even a lower acreage of oats this year with a lower total production will result in very considerable quantities going under the loan program at 80 percent of parity.

It seems to me that, in view of the congressional goal of parity for these commodities, Congress will be failing in its duty if it does not take appropriate action on the amendment which is proposed in the case of oats, as well as in the case of the other commodities I have mentioned.

FEED WHEAT

Feed wheat, or wheat unfit for human consumption, is coming into this country in greatly increased quantities. For the year ending June 30, it is now estimated that our imports from Canada will be more than 40,000,000 bushels, the highest by far in modern agricultural history, if not for all time.

At least, the table, exhibit D, which I offer at this time, being imports of wheat unfit for human consumption, indicates that this is by far the highest figure for the period covered beginning with the year 1933.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT D

Imports: Wheat unfit for human consumption

[In thousands of bushels]

Year beginning July 1—	From Canada	From all others	Total imports
1933.....	6	0	6
1934.....	8,128	18	8,146
1935.....	9,163	42	9,205
1936.....	4,040	17	4,057
1937.....	4	0	4

EXHIBIT D—Continued

[In thousands of bushels]

Year beginning July 1—	From Canada	From all others	Total imports
1938.....	187	21	208
1939.....	11	75	86
1940.....	3,180	57	3,237
1941.....	1,770	16	1,786
1942.....	150	0	150
1943.....	187	2	189
1944.....	15,919	0	15,919
1945.....	719	7	726
1946.....	28	0	28
1947.....	118	0	118
1948.....	10	1	11
1949.....	1,097	(1)	1,097
1950.....	11,647	0	11,647
1951.....	40,000	—	—

¹ Less than 500 bushels.

² Preliminary estimate.

Source: Data for years 1933 through 1950 from the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations, U. S. Department of Agriculture. Compiled from official records, Bureau of the Census and of the U. S. Tariff Commission.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, it happens that there has been a considerable increase in Canadian feed wheat production in recent years. Transportation costs for moving wheat from the surplus producing areas of the country to the far eastern and far western consuming areas have gone up more rapidly than transportation rates in Canada. Production costs have also increased faster here, including farm wage rates. The result is that these imports have reduced considerably the demand for wheat in the United States of feeding quality. Normally there are considerable quantities of such wheat because of adverse harvest conditions and problems of infestation in storage. In the case of one variety of wheat, red durum, which is grown in substantial quantities in South Dakota, much of it is normally consumed as feed wheat.

The Feed Situation, issued on April 11 by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, states in the last paragraph on page 8, in a review of wheat feeding in 1952-53:

The total tonnage of wheat to be fed in 1952-53 probably will be at least as large as during the current season. During the current October to September feeding season, about 150,000,000 bushels are expected to be fed, including low quality wheat from Canada. If the domestic feed supply situation should turn less favorable in 1952-53, increasing quantities of low quality wheat and feed grains could be supplied by Canada, since substantial quantities of these grains will be carried over into 1952-53.

In other words, the Department is reporting that very substantial quantities of surplus grains are available in Canada which serve to depress prices here, making very certain that unless steps are taken in connection with restoring section 104 and adding to it the commodities rye, barley, oats, and feed wheat or wheat unfit for human consumption, the congressional goal of parity for these commodities is simply a hollow and empty promise.

It was never intended that the price-support programs, established to insure orderly marketing, a fair share of income for farmers, and ample production to meet the Nation's needs, would be utilized as a magnet to attract in the

same products from outside the Nation's borders.

Instead, it was intended, through the enactment of section 22 and its subsequent amendments, that the price-support program to the farmers and the Government's investment in it would be protected and that prompt administrative steps would be taken by Executive order by the President.

A step in that kind was taken in 1941 by President Roosevelt in the case of wheat for milling purposes, or wheat for human consumption, following an investigation and a report to the President, dated May 19, 1941, by the United States Tariff Commission. An Executive order was issued which established an annual quota of 800,000 bushels of wheat and 4,000,000 pounds of flour which might be brought into the United States annually. In the case of wheat, most of this quota was assigned to Canada. Cotton producers were similarly provided assistance by Executive order.

In the case of wheat, however, there is no limitation on the quantities of feed wheat which may be brought into the country, and the tariff which was long 10 percent ad valorem at ports of entry in the case of feed wheat have been reduced by negotiations carried on by the State Department to 5 percent ad valorem at ports of entry.

This duty, in view of lower production and transportation costs in Canada, affords no protection to American producers. Indeed, the chief reason why we have not been flooded with cheaper feed grains from Canada is the difficulties encountered in the Canadian transportation situation. Canadian railroads frequently have to borrow freight cars from American carriers, and our own transportation situation has not permitted unlimited loans of these cars.

CANADIAN PRODUCTION PATTERN AFFECTED

There is an additional point not to be overlooked. That is that in the absence of any quotas to protect American producers, Canadian production patterns are undergoing some change. For instance, the three prairie provinces which supply most of the surplus oats apparently stabilized production somewhere in the magnitude of 225,000,000 bushels a year for a considerable period. This production has now moved upward as a result of the influence of the American market opened through tariff reductions, and most crop estimators now expect Canadian production of oats in the same provinces to average around 325,000,000 bushels annually.

The prospect of a continued rise in Canadian imports, plus the trend of our own acreage in the face of increased production asked by the United States Department of Agriculture, which goals are not being met, is not pleasant to contemplate. Our producers need encouragement. The table marked "Exhibit E" shows the downward trend of our feed-grain acreage.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have that table printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT E

Harvested acreage of crops, United States, 1931-51^{1 2}

[In thousands of acres]

Year	Corn, all	Oats	Barley	Sorghum grain	Feed grains
1931.....	106,866	40,193	11,181	4,443	162,683
1932.....	110,577	41,700	13,206	4,400	169,883
1933.....	108,918	36,528	9,641	4,354	156,441
1934.....	92,193	29,455	6,577	2,396	130,621
1935.....	95,974	40,109	12,456	4,597	153,116
1936.....	93,154	33,654	8,329	2,793	137,930
1937.....	93,930	35,542	9,869	4,915	144,356
1938.....	92,160	36,042	10,610	4,699	143,511
1939.....	88,279	33,460	12,739	4,760	139,238
1940.....	86,429	35,431	13,525	6,374	141,759
1941.....	85,367	38,161	14,276	6,015	143,809
1942.....	87,347	38,197	16,958	5,991	148,513
1943.....	92,060	38,914	14,900	6,889	152,763
1944.....	94,014	39,672	12,301	9,385	155,372
1945.....	88,079	41,933	10,465	6,408	146,885
1946.....	88,489	43,205	10,411	6,773	148,878
1947.....	83,932	38,451	11,014	5,629	139,026
1948.....	86,067	40,198	11,987	7,296	145,548
1949.....	87,029	40,440	9,857	6,612	143,938
1950.....	81,817	40,733	11,153	10,335	144,038
1951.....	81,306	30,454	9,391	8,449	135,600

¹ Crop Production, 1951 Annual Summary, Crop Reporting Board, U. S. Department of Agriculture, December 1951, p. 36.

² The 1950 acreages are revised on the basis of the 1950 Census of Agriculture and other check data.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I believe United States interests can be temporarily protected by the suggested amendment, without doing serious injury to any group.

The Government's interest from the standpoint of the Treasury is not the least interest that we should take into account. It is unthinkable that the Government should acquire considerable quantities of these feed grains through commodity credit programs, then encourage their export at prices below the acquisition costs of the Government or give them away under foreign-aid programs, while at the same time meeting a substantial portion of our domestic needs by imports for which we pay cash.

To a considerable extent this is the policy we have been following. I think it is high time that there should be a moratorium on this conflict in policy, a halt until a full examination of the subject can be made by Congress. This is the course of action which I propose, a course of action I hope that the Senate will adopt.

CONTINUANCE OF CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT, 1916

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2437) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended, and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I withdraw my previous motion to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment, as amended, beginning on page 11, in line 6, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, no other committee amendments are pending. Why cannot we proceed now to vote on the question of the final passage of the bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I seek the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], I move to strike out section 6, as amended, beginning on page 7, in line 3, down to and including line 4, on page 9 of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion submitted by the Senator from Michigan, for himself and the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, section 6 provides for the expenditure by the United States Government of \$8,000,000 for completing the construction of a road in the Republic of Nicaragua. The road is known as the Rama Road.

A few years ago the Senate of the United States was interested in an investigation of the construction of the Inter-American Highway. At that time I was a member of the so-called Truman committee, which decided to make an investigation of that highway. The Truman committee then sent a subcommittee to various Latin-American Republics, to examine into the building of the highway, because its construction was costing so much more than ever had been anticipated.

The members of the subcommittee discovered that the military authorities had gone there first and had spent many millions of dollars for the building of the highway, and then the Bureau of Public Roads decided that the road which had been laid out and built by the military authorities was, at least in part, not in accordance with what the Bureau of Public Roads desired the road to be; so that Bureau discarded the portion of the highway which had been built by the military engineers, and began to build its own highway.

We have spent many millions of dollars and much time on building the highway known as the Inter-American Highway. This particular item of \$8,000,000, however, does not relate to the building of the Inter-American Highway.

When I traveled over the road which was built, I went by jeep, automobile, airplane, or donkey. When I reached Nicaragua, I discovered that a road had been built to the east. I asked the persons who were taking me over the section just north of Managua where that particular highway went. I was advised that it had nothing to do with the Inter-American Highway, and that therefore I would not be interested in that part of the highway. I asked whether any money provided by the United States Government was to be used in the building of the highway. At first there was an evasive answer, but finally the statement was made that no appropriated money had been spent from the funds for the Inter-American Highway.

After I drove some 35 kilometers on the highway, I discovered that the United States Government had spent \$4,000,000 for construction of the highway east to Bluefields, which is on the Atlantic coast. I was advised that the reason why the Congress would not be concerned with that highway was that it was a personal matter with the President of the United States and the President of Nicaragua.

When I returned to the United States, I discovered that the \$4,000,000 which had been spent on the Rama Road had been obtained from the President's so-called private or secret funds. The President had advanced, for the building of that highway, \$4,000,000 of the money of the taxpayers of the United States; and at that time more money was being requested for that purpose.

Mr. President, that highway was not the only one built outside the Inter-American Highway on which we were spending millions of dollars. I discovered that another million dollars had been spent for the building of a highway around a lake. Ferryboats had been operating across the lake for many, many years; but when the war came it was decided that a highway should be built around the lake.

Mr. President, I wonder what we are really preparing for. For what purpose is the American taxpayer spending his money? Is it for preparedness? Is it for preparedness against what we call the common enemy, namely, communism or Russia or her satellites; or is it because of a desire of the United States to try to purchase good will all over the world?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Is this road being constructed, or has it been constructed, by American contractors?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would say that a portion of it was built by American contractors and another portion was built by local labor; but the United States was paying for it. The United States spent money there to the tune of \$4,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Is equipment with which the work on the road may be continued now there?

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, no; all the equipment has been removed. I was there in 1948.

Mr. AIKEN. What are the specific benefits which will accrue to the United States from further work on that road?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not find that there will be any benefits.

Mr. AIKEN. I note the statement in the report that there would be benefits to the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have made some notations on page 372 of the hearings from which I should like to read, to show the Senator that there would be no benefits.

Mr. AIKEN. Is there American-owned property within the area traversed by the road?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. AIKEN. None at all?

Mr. FERGUSON. None at all. I shall endeavor to state the reasons for the claim that we should agree to build this highway. Many years ago there was talk about an agreement covering the acquisition of land upon which to build a canal across that section of Nicaragua; so, in order to satisfy Nicaragua, the President of the United States, without advising the Congress at all and without having obtained any kind of authority from the Congress, agreed that he would build the highway for the Nicaraguan Government.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the United States own a right-of-way for a canal?

Mr. FERGUSON. There is a perpetual treaty giving the United States a right-of-way for a canal. But this highway has nothing to do with the canal, it is no part of the canal.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the treaty provide that the United States shall pay for the canal zone, in the event the canal is built? I realize that I am going back into ancient history somewhat, but I should like to know.

Mr. FERGUSON. The United States has a treaty with Nicaragua giving our country a perpetual and exclusive right to build a canal through Nicaragua. In 1914, we cemented the agreement by paying \$3,000,000 to Nicaragua. So I assume that the \$3,000,000 was the purchase price of a permanent and perpetual right-of-way for the canal. I find nothing which indicates that we owe any further money for the right to build the canal.

But, Mr. President, we have put \$4,000,000 into this particular highway. As we moved north on the Inter-American Highway I discovered another black-top road leading off the highway. I asked where that highway led. I was told that it was not a part of the Inter-American Highway. When I asked who built it, I was told that the United States had built it. Why did the United States build this spur road? The reason given was that the President of Nicaragua had a farm about 16 or 18 miles off the highway, so the United States used the money of American taxpayers for the purpose of building a highway to the farm of the President of Nicaragua.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. How does that distinguish Nicaragua from certain areas in the United States?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not know that it does. But I say there is less rhyme and less reason for building a road to the residence of the President of Nicaragua through the use of the American taxpayers' money, than there would be if we were building a similar road in the United States. I suppose it is a question of degree.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I know the Senator from Michigan wants to be fair.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is a correct statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sure he wants to be fair even with respect to the President or the king of some foreign country.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; the Senator from Michigan desires to be fair to everyone.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the fact is that the road in question goes through a part of the property of the President of Nicaragua—

Mr. FERGUSON. It goes toward it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; that is correct. In that case, I submit there is no more significance in that than there is with respect to Highway 66, which passes the Governor's mansion at Springfield, Ill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Wait a moment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know the history of the road referred to.

Mr. FERGUSON. The spur road had nothing to do with the contract covering the construction of the Inter-American Highway. It was a spur leading off the Inter-American Highway to the President's farm, 16 or 18 miles from the highway.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Perhaps the natives were becoming Americanized, and had learned to do it that way. That happens in the United States, too, as the Senator knows.

Mr. FERGUSON. If that is the way by which we are to Americanize other people, I say to the Senator that we are not going to keep them Americanized very long. The Nicaraguans are one of the peoples of America.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. They ought to be interested in the things which interest us.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Why not tell the people of the United States the history of the Rama Road?

Mr. FERGUSON. I intend to tell them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The people of the United States ought to know. I have been in the country to which reference is being made. I am not prejudiced.

Mr. FERGUSON. I intend to tell the people of the United States about the Rama Road. At this critical time, when we have such a huge deficit, we should not be sending \$8,000,000 to Nicaragua to be used in the construction of a highway which we have no obligation to build, and which would be of no value to the taxpayers of the United States so far as defense purposes are concerned at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the Senator from Michigan vote for the last ECA bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think so, after certain deductions had been made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Did the Senator know that that bill contained an appropriation of \$27,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money for the benefit of Great Britain, to enable her to fulfill her obligation to Guatemala? The Senator voted for that bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I did not know that such an appropriation was contained in that bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the statement of the United States Ambassador to Nicaragua, beginning on page 370 of the hearings on the pending bill, is revealing.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is very revealing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is revealing, for in a statement which appears on page 373 of the hearings, the Ambassador says:

The position taken by some Members of the Congress that no such commitment should be made or is valid until the Congress provides the money is a proper one for debate in Washington, but it confuses Nicaraguans.

Mr. President, I should not be a bit surprised if secret commitments and commitments which are in contravention of law or for which there is no authority, should result in confusing people. How long can the State Department and the President capriciously and arbitrarily commit this country and the Public Treasury, and then endeavor to make it appear that it confuses people? I suppose we ought to confuse some folk a little more.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am not for this authorization merely because it confuses people. I am for it because I feel that, inasmuch as Uncle Sam is so powerful and so great, he should keep his promises. If the Senator from Michigan will bear with me for a moment—

Mr. FERGUSON. Indeed, I am glad to listen to what the Senator from New Mexico has to say. If necessary, I would ask unanimous consent that he might continue.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If Senators will be patient with me, I will tell them the history of this authorization. In 1914 we thought it might be necessary to build the Nicaraguan canal. So Mr. Bryan and the diplomatic representatives of Nicaragua got together. As a result, Nicaragua gave the United States the right, in perpetuity, to build the Nicaraguan canal. Of course, the people of Nicaragua felt that through the building of the canal certain benefits would accrue to them. The fact is that the authorization is now for the amount of \$8,000,000, and even if it were increased above that by \$4,000,000, the amount would be far less than it would have cost Uncle Sam to build the Nicaraguan canal. Uncle Sam never did build it. I think it was a pretty good business proposition, even if we had given \$12,000,000.

I do not believe the President had any right to make any commitment. Only Congress had such right; but Congress had accepted and ratified a so-called sacred treaty, all the benefits of which were on our side. That is the only justification I can see for the building of the Rama Road.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Where is the obligation that comes from the treaty? We were notified in 1942 that the canal was not economically feasible and it had no relationship whatsoever to the 165 miles of east-west highway. An effort was made to justify it on the ground that it

had defensive value, but when General Eisenhower was serving as Chief of Staff he said, as will be noted in the hearings, that it could have hemispheric value. He did not say it had such value. Had we gone there to build a canal, whether it was a barge canal or a blue-water canal, we would have put up all the money and Nicaragua would have derived a very substantial part of the benefits. But what has that to do with an east-west road?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It has this to do with an east-west road: Evidently, from the testimony of Mr. Miller, the Assistant Secretary of State, and that of Ambassador Waynick, if we did not build the canal it would be only fitting and proper that we should build them a road for \$8,000,000. We still have a perpetual right, but we are not doing anything about it.

That is the only justification I can see. There is no idea of confusing any one; that does not appeal to me at all; but I feel that if we asked for the right to build a canal and were given the right to build it, we obligated ourselves to build it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. We paid \$3,000,000 for the right in 1914. We paid for the perpetual right. Where is the consideration for the \$4,000,000, and now the \$8,000,000—\$12,000,000 in all?

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is a saving to Uncle Sam of \$800,000,000. It would have cost \$800,000,000 to build that canal.

Mr. FERGUSON. We were not under any obligation to build it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We talk about fair play, Mr. President. The difficulty with some persons is that they see only the power of might and not the power of justice, decency, and dignity.

Mr. FERGUSON. What I am trying to figure out today is how to accord fair play to the American taxpayers. We are talking about fair play for everyone else, but when we suggest that there should be fair play for the American taxpayers, we are criticized for it.

Let us see whether this project is of military value. Is there any opinion now to the effect that it is of military value? When was Dwight Eisenhower Chief of Staff? It was back in 1946 and 1947, 5 years ago. Is there any member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff today who will say that from a military standpoint we should spend \$8,000,000 on the Rama road? I should like to hear one of them come before the committee and advocate that it is a military necessity, if the war which we are preparing to fight should come, and that we should spend that large sum of money.

Mr. President, has not the time come when we should be considerate of the taxpayers' money? If there ever was an item not essential, not necessary, and not even desirable, it is this Rama road item.

I read from the hearings:

It seems clear, however, that President Roosevelt and the Department did not contemplate that the matter would require at any time a special congressional appropriation,

believing that the allocation from the emergency fund would suffice.

Mr. President, they thought they could take \$4,000,000 of the taxpayers' money out of a secret fund to build a highway—I am referring to the State Department, because the President would not know anything except what he was told at the time—and we would never know anything about it as Members of the Senate. The taxpayers would not know anything about it, and the road would be built in a foreign nation. It was thought that \$4,000,000 would complete the road. I read further:

Furthermore, I do not represent the road as having present military or other value to the United States.

There is the key to the situation. The State Department will not certify today that the road has any military or other value to the United States.

I read further:

But I am firmly of the opinion that this commitment to Nicaragua should be honored and the road completed for the following considerations.

Mr. President, we had a treaty with Nicaragua. The President of the United States has no inherent right to cancel that treaty without the consent of the Congress which had ratified it in 1914. If there were a waterway constructed across the country, it might become a very valuable asset. Not all the people in Nicaragua believe that highways are good things. I remember when we were driving along one of the highways, not at this particular place, a farmer was coming down the hill driving some little pigs to market. We stopped and asked him, through the interpreter, how he liked the new highway. He said he did not like it at all. When asked why, he said it was too hard on the pigs' feet, that he could not very well drive them to market. He then showed me shoes which he had put on his pigs' feet. He had cut out leather shoes and tied them on the feet of the little pigs so that he could take them to market.

We are not making friends of all those people, not by a long shot.

Mr. President, I desire to show some of the facts about this highway. I read further from the hearings, from the testimony of the United States Ambassador to Nicaragua, who was a member of the State Department's official family. This statement is filed as a part of the State Department's information:

While I do not attempt to justify the building of the Rama Road for direct benefit of the United States, I do believe that a system of roads including the Inter-American Highway and lateral branches in the Latin-American Republics can be of great substantial value to the United States as they pave the way to better communication, and the consequent development of commerce with populations now nearly equal in the aggregate to our own.

Then he goes on to say:

I do not suggest this amendment of the contract places us under any additional obligation with respect to the Rama Road. It does represent, however, a cooperative spirit in Nicaragua worthy of respect. And it does cut the cost of the Inter-American Highway

and the Rama job to about what we had planned to spend on the former.

Mr. Miller, who represented the State Department, seems to be in some doubt that the sum mentioned would complete the highway. He said:

Since it is part of the agreement and this \$8,000,000 is estimated not only as the amount to complete the road as far as we are committed to build it, but to complete this survey, so as not, in any way, changing the amount of the authorization, but simply to conform the purposes of the authorization to the agreement.

Mr. President, surely Congress is not going to authorize the expenditure of \$8,000,000 for this purpose.

In this record there is no showing by the military authorities that it is of any value. The only showing which was made that the road could have hemispheric defense value was back in 1947, when General Eisenhower was Chief of Staff.

Mr. President, when is the time coming that we will spend the taxpayers' dollars for the defense of America and in places where we have reason to believe there may be an attack? We know something about the prospect we are facing. We in Congress know something about what we are defending, or are preparing to defend. We know of the millions and billions of dollars which have been spent. But certainly the Rama Road is not a project on which the taxpayers should put their money.

Mr. President, in the pending bill the Senate eliminated \$100,000,000 from the appropriation for highways because we believed the time had come when there should be some economy and less should be spent on our own highways. We have heard today about the condition of highways in America and the amount needed to be spent on them. Just a few minutes ago, by a vote of 47 to 14, as I recall, we took \$100,000,000 from the appropriation for the highways of the American people. Yet we find this authorization before us. We have been able to keep this \$8,000,000 item out of the bill so far. No request for this authorization was made until it was discovered by the State Department that the Committee on Appropriations did not want to appropriate money on the basis of a flimsy executive agreement, without consideration, without any rhyme or reason. But now we find that it is to be authorized.

I say that if the Senate votes for the authorization of an appropriation for a nonmilitary project the money will be appropriated for it, and the first thing we know the people will pay \$8,000,000 for the construction of this highway.

It is not the Inter-American Highway; it does not have anything to do with the Inter-American Highway. It is an east-west highway extending approximately 160 miles, on which we have already spent \$4,000,000. But that was 4 or 5 years ago, not now. The road-building machinery is not there. We have no obligation to continue the construction of the road, and certainly we should not authorize \$8,000,000, because it will be taken from the taxpayers' money, and the taxpayers need the money for their own highways and military expendi-

tures, rather than for this nonessential item.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it the Senator's suggestion that the \$8,000,000 allocation provided by the bill should be transferred to some other part of the bill, to be spent here at home?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; but I think the Senator from Oklahoma has made a good suggestion.

Mr. KERR. I was asking a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I had not advocated that.

Mr. KERR. Very well.

Mr. FERGUSON. But I think the Senator from Oklahoma has made a good suggestion, namely, that the \$8,000,000 had much better be added to the funds for the highways of America than utilized for this nonmilitary, unnecessary project.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, at the outset I wish to say that this is a matter upon which our committee, a completely nonpolitical committee, agreed by unanimous decision of all members of the committee, from both sides of the aisle, that the United States was so committed, and its good faith so involved, that there was no course which we could properly take, no course which we believed the Government of the United States or the people of the United States would want to take, except to move ahead with this project and complete it at the estimated cost of \$8,000,000, provided in the bill.

The whole matter is set forth very fully in the printed hearing record, which is on the table of every Member of the Senate. I wish to call attention particularly to pages 367 to 376, inclusive, of the hearing record. Obviously, it is too much to read at this time. I believe the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] has very accurately stated the beginning of this situation.

There was a contract earlier entered into between our Nation and Nicaragua, by which we were to have the right to construct a second canal across Central America through Nicaragua. Interpretation of that contract was not identical when seen through the eyes of the United States and the eyes of Nicaragua. The United States felt that all we had was an option to build a second canal if and when we wanted to build it. Nicaragua understood, and stoutly maintained, that we were obligated to build that canal. The committee felt that that was much too far behind us, coming, as it had, more than 10 years ago, for us to attempt to go back that far to determine who was right and who was wrong in that contention.

We did have the statement of an Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Edward G. Miller, Jr., who appeared before us at great length and stated the facts. We had before us the written statement of the former Ambassador to Nicaragua, now Ambassador to Colombia, Hon. Capus M. Waynick, of North Carolina, who incidentally at one time was, I believe, a member of the highway department of the State of North Carolina, and

knew considerable about the values and the construction problems involved in connection with this road.

We had before us other testimony, which rather clearly showed what happened shortly after the time of the outbreak of World War II. At that time certain conversations were held between the then President of the United States, President Roosevelt, and the head of the Republic of Nicaragua, President Somoza. The Senate will find in the third paragraph of page 368 of the hearings a statement which I think is the crux of the whole situation. It reads as follows:

Accordingly, on April 8, 1942, this Government in an official note stated that it would be willing to construct a highway between San Benito and Rama and to survey and recommend a route from Rama to El Bluff.

Mr. President, there are no "ifs" or "ands" about that. That was an official note from this Government to the government of Nicaragua more than 10 years ago, in which the committee felt, without exception, the good faith of the United States of America was involved, and in which our credit was pledged to that extent.

It appeared that after that note had been delivered, the President of the United States went ahead, under emergency powers and an emergency appropriation which he then had, to commence the construction of the road. As I understand, nearly half the road has been constructed. The maps filed with our committee are available here, and any Member of the Senate who is present can see them.

In the meantime, costs have risen, and it was very difficult during the war to press the construction of the road. By the time the war was over, after \$4,000,000 had been spent upon it, the road was not half completed. It then became necessary for the matter to be revived from time to time, and at this time, as I say, the committee went exhaustively into the situation and felt that too long already had the decision been left in abeyance, and that we should act to redeem the very solemn promise of the United States, made in writing, and followed up by the expenditure of \$4,000,000, which the President had unquestioned authority to expend, at a time when he had authority to expend it, and upon a project which he had committed the United States to build.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that not only was there a consideration moving to the United States, in that Nicaragua abandoned her contention to the effect that we were obligated to build the second canal, but likewise there was another consideration, growing out of the fact that Nicaragua made available to us, for the conduct of the war, certain ports on the Pacific side of Nicaragua.

At this time I ask Senators to refer to page 369, beginning with the statement by Mr. Miller, which I shall read:

Mr. MILLER. That is correct. I might point out in that connection that during World War II we received very valuable cooperation from Nicaragua, which was agreed upon just about that time, in connection with the use

of certain ports on the Pacific coast in which we, in effect, got base rights.

Senator HOLLAND. And did the granting of those base rights and the cooperation of Nicaragua, falling at that same time, constitute a part of the over-all objective which the President of the United States Government had in view?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; very much so.

Senator HOLLAND. And are you stating for the record that the advantage received by the United States to which you have just referred with regard to these matters was regarded as being highly helpful in the furtherance and pursuance of the war effort?

Mr. MILLER. That is correct, Senator HOLLAND.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was Nicaragua in the war with us, as one of our allies?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the record shows that she declared war the very day after we did.

Mr. FERGUSON. And she was one of our allies throughout the war?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Here we have a statement from the official of our State Department who handles public business not only with Nicaragua, but other Latin-American nations, describing the relationship and the agreement entered into at that time, an agreement which we, as a committee, unanimously felt had been only partially performed.

The amount involved is not large. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], who would be glad to see this amount—and other amounts, if we had them—devoted to the construction of domestic projects.

I am one Senator who believes that we should be just in carrying out our commitments as we do things which are eminently more pleasant to us, that is, building roads for ourselves and our own people. I feel that if members of the committee from the other side of the aisle were present—I notice that one of them is now present—each of them would state what I have stated. This was a hard decision for the committee to make, but one which was made unanimously. Incidentally, we had the advantage of the observations made on the ground only last year by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and by two members of the committee from the other side of the aisle. As I recall, they were the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. All were of the same opinion, that this was something that our Nation should do.

I hope there will be no disposition on the part of the Senate not to follow the committee in this matter, because I believe that the committee was acting to redeem a very solemn commitment by our Government, made in time of great stress, and partly carried out, now needing only this appropriation and the work authorized herein to fulfill the commitment of our Nation made through our wartime President. Regardless of how we may feel about that President—and I am one who frequently found myself in disagreement with him—he very active-

ly handled the conduct of the war. In a matter of this kind, in which he acted for our entire Nation, when the contract is only partly carried out, I believe that we should all stand together behind that commitment and wind it up. Certainly that is the position of each member of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida to yield before he yields the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thought I was yielding to the Senator from Michigan for a question. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that our country has the option at this time, under an agreement previously made with Nicaragua, to build a second canal across Nicaragua if we should feel impelled by necessity to do so?

Mr. HOLLAND. It was my understanding, and the understanding of the committee, that that agreement, that formal contract before World War II, is still in effect, and that we still have that right. The thing with respect to which the two governments were on different sides in their interpretation was this: The United States Government contended that we had an option to build it, but were not obligated to do so, whereas the Government of Nicaragua contended that we had an obligation to build, and not a mere option to do so.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator for that statement. I was eliciting that information in order to lead up to the next question.

Is it the understanding of the Senator from Florida, and was it the understanding of the committee, that the provision for the building of this road was not only for the purpose that there might be transportation facilities between the two oceans, but also, in a way, to reaffirm and attach validity to the continuing option which we have to build the canal in the event we should need or desire to do so in the future?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct, with the further understanding that by this arrangement the situation was changed, so that the agreement between the two countries was thereafter recognized by both as merely an option, without involving a positive obligation upon the part of the United States to build, as had been claimed prior to that time by the Republic of Nicaragua.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does not the Senator also feel not only that the building of this road would make a substantial contribution to our national defense, but also that preservation of the validity of the option would be a valuable consideration in the future defense of our country?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course that is true. The Senator from Florida is not sure that the continuing validity of the option is dependent upon our performing this construction. On that point he would not be completely positive.

Mr. KERR. But that question is involved in the consideration of the provision in the bill and in the discussions between the representatives of the two governments, is it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. The composition of all differences in point of view with reference to the entire situation includes this authorization.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, just a few words in reply.

I do not find in the record anything to show that the building of the road is a consideration for the cancellation of the formal treaty with respect to construction of the canal. I am wondering now whether it is the contention of the committee that by building this road we are canceling the right to build the canal, and forfeiting the \$3,000,000 which we paid in 1914. I believe that if this proposal involves a cancellation of that treaty—

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KERR. Did not the Senator from Michigan just hear the Senator from Florida say that it did not cancel the option, but that in his opinion it firmed up the validity and continuance of the option?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to have pointed out to me anything in the record which would show that to be a fact. I am trying to find out whether this is a new agreement or a cancellation of the treaty, or a determination by the Congress to modify or cancel the treaty. The facts on that point are not in the Record.

I should like to read to the Senate what Mr. Miller said, to the effect that this was not a binding agreement so far as the Congress was concerned. As the Supreme Court of the United States said in yesterday's opinion, only Congress can appropriate money; only Congress can authorize the payment of money. I read from page 368 of the printed hearings. In speaking of the State Department, Mr. Miller said:

The Department realizes fully that such an agreement cannot bind the Congress later to appropriate funds for its fulfillment. In this case, however, funds, which were properly available to the Executive for such an agreement and which were considered adequate when it was made, were exhausted when the agreement was only partially honored.

Mr. President, we thought that \$4,000,000 would be sufficient to build the highway. The President of the United States provided \$4,000,000 with which to build the highway. Then it was discovered that the \$4,000,000 would be sufficient to build less than half the highway and that the other half would cost \$8,000,000 to construct, instead of \$4,000,000.

Mr. President, whence do these estimates come? Will \$8,000,000 be sufficient to build the rest of the highway?

Will the Administration not return next year for another appropriation?

Let me turn to page 372.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator from Michigan read the paragraph which immediately follows the statement which he has read from the testimony of Mr. Miller?

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 368?

Mr. KERR. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Miller continues:

Nicaragua, understandably, looks upon the agreement as a formal and binding commitment of the United States Government, regardless of the relations between the executive and legislative branches. It confidently expects that the Congress of the United States will honor this agreement by providing funds for its fulfillment. The Bureau of Public Roads estimates that the \$8,000,000 authorized in this bill would be sufficient for this purpose. Nicaragua is a country whose government and people are particularly friendly to the United States and who offer consistent and valuable support for United States policy in international matters of the greatest importance. The Department believes it would be most unfortunate if Nicaragua's confidence in the fulfillment of an agreement made in good faith with the United States were to be frustrated.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, must not other peoples who make commitments with anyone in the State Department remember that our officials must follow the law? Must we always conform to what other nations think the United States Constitution says? Must it always be that way? I think not. Let us find out on what the estimate is based.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at this point. The estimate which is found on page 372, is based on the resident engineer's figures of November 1948, and it breaks down as follows: The grand total is \$8,000,000.

Mr. President, where in this record is there any evidence that \$8,000,000 will be sufficient to do the work which was estimated by the resident engineer in 1948 to cost \$8,000,000? Will \$8,000,000 be sufficient? If the estimate increased from \$4,000,000 to \$12,000,000 from the time they started the road until 1948—and they started it in 1943 or 1944—how do we know that it will be possible to complete the construction of the highway for an additional \$8,000,000?

However, Mr. President, that is not the point. The point is whether or not we should not screen every item of appropriation and authorization to determine where we can reduce the deficit spending of the United States, because the \$8,000,000 will eventually have to be a part of the \$14,000,000,000 of deficit spending. In other words, this great country must borrow the money by bond issues and pay interest on it in order to build this highway in Nicaragua. Yet the Senate today has eliminated from this bill—and I think rightly so—\$100,000,000 which we felt should not be spent on the highways of America. Ordinarily that amount of money would have been

appropriated for highways in America. But now every Senator realizes that the time has come when we must look everywhere for items which can be properly cut without interfering with the national defense.

Mr. President, there is not a scintilla of evidence in this record after 1947 or 1948, when the Chief of Staff said that the road could have some hemispheric value, to show that it has any value so far as military purposes are concerned. Even the Ambassador does not make that claim.

Mr. President, we must save our raw materials. We know that in the last year we have not been able to get sufficient material with which to build highways in America. Steel is so short that highways in the State of Michigan, as is true in other States as well, cannot be built. Yet we are asked to authorize an expenditure of \$8,000,000, which would take steel and machinery and many other items in short supply in America, in order to build a highway which we have no legal or constitutional obligation to build.

I certainly hope that the Senate will strike this committee amendment from the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the road is finished, irrespective of whether the conclusions of the Senator from Michigan are correct or whether the conclusions of the committee are correct, does the Senator know the kind of cars that will be rolling on that road?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They will probably come from Detroit.

Mr. FERGUSON. Probably some of them will come from Detroit. Nevertheless, the time has come when Senators must consider not only what will be beneficial to their own cities and their own States, but what will be best for the Nation. A much bigger issue confronts us than merely providing benefits for the people back home in our respective States. The issue is bigger than all that. It is a question of doing without things that America, not Michigan or Detroit, can do without and not cause harm to the whole Nation. We cannot be selfish and look merely to our own bailiwicks. We must look at the broader national picture when we are trying to save money and keep within the budget. It makes no difference to the Senator from Michigan that construction of the road would sell a few more cars. That is not the point. We must do what is right from the standpoint of the taxpayers of America; not on behalf of Michigan taxpayers only, but on behalf of all the taxpayers of this great Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I fully agree with the Senator from Michigan that the position of all of us should be based upon what we think is the right thing to do and to the best interest of our own Nation. I know he is taking his position on

that ground. I should like to have him think that all Members of the committee felt they were taking their position on similarly high ground.

Mr. FERGUSON. I certainly agree to that.

Mr. HOLLAND. It was and is the opinion of the committee, having in mind the specific fact—and there is no question about the fact—that on April 8, 1942, this Government, in an official note, stated that it would be willing to construct a highway between San Benito and Rama, and to survey and recommend a route from Rama to El Bluff; and having in mind the fact that the road is only half completed and that at the time the agreement was made the President of the United States had full right to make the agreement and had funds in hand with which it could have been done, which funds were entrusted to him alone for spending, which, however, did not suffice in getting the work completed before the war came to an end, it was our view that there was nothing that we in this Nation could do but to see that agreement to its completion.

I close by reminding the Senator from Michigan that at the time the agreement was entered into, in April 1942, Nicaragua, with its frontage of many hundreds of miles both on the Caribbean Sea and on the Pacific Ocean, was subjected, just as was my own State at that time, to submarine attack. We had submarines on both coasts. It was no small matter that that little Republic of Nicaragua was willing to stand by us and make available bases to us. Speaking as one Senator it seems to me that here was a real consideration moving to the United States and that the President of the United States recognized that consideration when he gave Nicaragua the assurance, by written commitment of our Government, that this work would be done. I feel that we should now observe that commitment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in regard to the item of \$8,000,000, I should like to call attention to the 1948 estimate.

The State Department now claims that the promise we made was not a promise to spend \$8,000,000; the State Department claims that our pledge to Nicaragua was not to provide a specific sum of money for the building of the Rama Road, but that our pledge was to build the road.

Thus, Mr. President, under that theory, if we now authorize the expenditure of \$8,000,000 for that road, we shall not be fulfilling our agreement; and if the \$8,000,000 were sufficient to complete the construction of only half the road, we would be requested to provide additional funds, in order to complete the road, for it would be claimed that we would be bound to appropriate all the money needed to complete construction of the road.

Thus, Mr. President, the time for us to stop is now. Now is the time to say that the construction of this road was not authorized by Congress, that when the President thought he could have the entire road built for \$4,000,000, and proceeded to make the \$4,000,000 available,

he was acting without congressional authority. The \$4,000,000 which has been spent is water over the dam, that money is gone; but certainly we should not proceed now on the basis of a 1948 estimate of \$4,000,000, and at this time authorize the expenditure of an additional \$8,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McKellar
Anderson	Hendrickson	Millikin
Bennett	Hennings	Monroney
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bridges	Hill	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Nixon
Cain	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Ives	Pastore
Chavez	Jenner	Robertson
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Dirksen	Kem	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Kilgore	Taft
Dworschak	Lehman	Thye
Ellender	Long	Underwood
Ferguson	Martin	Welker
Flanders	Maybank	Wiley
Fulbright	McCarran	Williams
George	McCarthy	Young
Gillette	McClellan	
Green	McFarland	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, briefly I should like to explain the purpose of this motion. It is to strike out section 6 of the bill, beginning with line 3, on page 7, and continuing through line 4, on page 9.

This section of the bill would authorize an appropriation of \$8,000,000 for the purpose of building a highway in Nicaragua in Central America. It is not at all part or parcel of the Inter-American Highway. The Inter-American Highway has not been completed. The original estimate of the cost of this road was \$2,000,000 to complete the project. During the war, the President expended out of his private funds \$4,000,000. In 1948, according to an estimate which we have, it was thought that \$8,000,000 would be required in order to complete the highway.

Mr. President, there is no legal obligation whatever upon the United States to build this highway. The Department of State said it was fully realized that the agreement it entered into could not bind the Congress to appropriate funds later for the purpose of fulfilling the agreement.

Mr. President, since we have stricken from the bill \$100,000,000 which was to have been used in our own country, because it was felt that we could not afford it, why at this time should we go into Central America and build this highway when we have deficit spending and must borrow the money with which to build the highway and must pay interest on the money?

The record shows that in 1947, when General Eisenhower was Chief of Staff, he stated that the building of this highway could have some hemispheric value; but there is nothing in the record to show that it would have any military value. In fact, there is evidence to the contrary.

Mr. President, I submit that we must spend our dollars for purposes which will aid the operations of our Government, contribute to the building of our roads and highways, and promote the defense effort. I submit that our allies should not expect us to waste money in this manner, outside the realm of our defense, at the present time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. When the Senator from Michigan stated that the President had spent \$4,000,000, I take it he meant that the President spent public funds, representing the taxpayers' money, which had been earmarked for use in Nicaragua.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. But during the war the President had a large fund, provided by the taxpayers, for which he did not have to account.

Mr. MUNDT. The theory was that it was to be spent on defense projects, some of which might be secret in nature. Is that not a fact?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and this road was said to be one of such projects.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I dislike to take the time of the Senate, but since a number of Senators are now in the Chamber who were not present when the matter was discussed, I merely want to call attention to the fact that on April 8, 1942, the Government of the United States, in an official note, stated it would be willing to construct a highway between San Benito and Rama and to survey a recommended road from Rama to El Bluff. That was an official expression in black and white by our President in time of war to one of our allies in the war at a very critical time in 1942. Under that commitment there were spent \$4,000,000 of public funds, emergency funds entrusted to the President. The only reason the project was not completed was that it could not be completed during the war years. There seemed to be no question in the mind of any member of the committee that our Nation was committed, and that it was our duty to see this project through.

Before I conclude, I may say, since it has not been mentioned before, that the House has recognized this obligation, and placed in the House bill an authorization of \$2,000,000 for each of the 2 years covered by the period of the House bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Florida claim that this cancels the treaty we have with Nicaragua under which we could build a canal there, or would it permit us, if we desired to do so, to build a canal across Nicaragua?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not so claim, but I claim that this obligation was undertaken by President Roosevelt to cause an abandonment on the part of Nicaragua of its claim that we were obligated to dig the second canal, rather than being merely permitted to do so, as we contended.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator from Florida examined the treaty?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have not.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does he claim that the treaty bound us to build the canal?

Mr. HOLLAND. No. All I claim is that it was very clearly shown by all the testimony before the committee, both that of the gentleman who was our Ambassador to Nicaragua, but is now our Ambassador to Colombia, and by the Secretary of State, and by the Assistant Secretary of State who handles Latin-American affairs, that the obligation had been made, and that the obligation still persists. We have the right to dig the canal if we wish to do it. Under the settlement made, our interpretation, rather than that of Nicaragua, prevails. We are not obligated to dig the canal, but we have the right to do so if we so elect.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to strike out all of section 6. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senators from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND and Mr. STENNIS] are unavoidably detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the United States to the International Labor Organization Conference, which is to meet in Geneva, Switzerland.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Delaware [Mr.

FREAR] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—45

Aiken	Hoey	Morse
Bennett	Ives	Mundt
Bricker	Jenner	Nixon
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kern	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Martin	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Maybank	Smith, N. J.
Duff	McCarran	Taft
Dworshak	McCarthy	Thye
Ferguson	McClellan	Underwood
Fulbright	Millikin	Welker
Hendrickson	Monroney	Wiley
Hickenlooper	Moody	Williams

NAYS—25

Anderson	Gillette	Lehman
Cain	Green	Long
Chavez	Hayden	McFarland
Clements	Hennings	McKellar
Connally	Hill	Robertson
Cordon	Holland	Smathers
Ellender	Humphrey	Young
Flanders	Kerr	
George	Kilgore	

NOT VOTING—26

Benton	Kefauver	O'Conor
Brewster	Knowland	Russell
Byrd	Langer	Seaton
Carlson	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Case	Magnuson	Sparkman
Eastland	Malone	Stennis
Ecton	McMahon	Tobey
Fear	Murray	Watkins
Hunt	Neely	

So the motion of Mr. FERGUSON, for himself and Mr. BRIDGES, was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 1549, House bill 7340.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355) as amended and supplemented to authorize appropriations

for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserting in lieu thereof the provisions of Senate bill 2437, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 7340) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KERR, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. CASE conferees on the part of the Senate.

REHABILITATION OF FEDERAL PRISONERS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the leadership on both sides of the aisle.

Out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, and I am going to ask for its immediate consideration. Its consideration should take less than 5 minutes.

On May 15 the President signed an act which would authorize the Attorney General to make small loans to deserving Federal prisoners at the time of their release from prison. The act also provided that the Attorney General might accept gifts or bequests of money for credit to the "Commissary funds, Federal prisoners," which could be deducted from income for certain tax purposes.

The Joint Committee on Taxation has called my attention to the fact that this particular section, through a clerical error, contains the word "state" instead of "estate" with reference to a type of tax. The bill I am introducing would simply correct that error, and substitute the word "estate" for "state" in the original enactment.

The senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] the chairman of the Finance Committee, has been advised of this error, and the amendment is perfectly agreeable to him.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, if what the Senator from Nevada desires may be done by unanimous consent, I have no objection.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not intend to object to the request of the Senator from Nevada, but I should like to ascertain what effect it will have on House bill 7072, the independent offices appropriation bill. I have been here since 10 o'clock this morning, and we had hoped that that bill would be considered. It was expected that we would finish with the road bill last evening, but it is now 4 o'clock this afternoon, and I do not believe we should bring

up this very important appropriation bill unless we are to have a night session and get somewhere with it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall make an announcement as to that in a moment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk and ask unanimous consent that the rule be suspended so that it may be immediately considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 3276) to amend the act entitled "An act to assist Federal prisoners in their rehabilitation," was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of May 15, 1952 (Public Law 342, 82d Cong.), relating to the rehabilitation of Federal prisoners, is hereby amended by striking out the words "Federal income, State, and gift taxes" and inserting in lieu thereof "Federal income, estate and gift taxes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1953

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 7072, the independent offices appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7072) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I made an announcement yesterday evening that in order to finish the road bill and the appropriation bill the Senate would have a night session, if necessary. So there will be a night session, and we will proceed with consideration of H. R. 7072. I hope we can finish it; if we do not, we will go as far as we can.

Mr. MAYBANK. That was exactly my understanding. We have been here all day accomplishing what could have been accomplished last evening in probably an hour or so.

I wish to make a unanimous-consent request, if it is agreeable to the majority leader and the minority leader. I should like to have the attention also of both leaders.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate first consider committee amendments to which there is no objection. I understand the amendment as to the TVA steam plants is quite controversial, and I understand there is quite a controversial issue as to the amount of public housing to be constructed. I have not heard that there is much controversy with respect to other amendments although there may be. There are some

slight amendments proposed with respect to the Selective Service System and the Battle Monuments Commission. I do not think there is any issue of consequence about them.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the amendments as I have suggested, so that we may really get under way. So far as I am concerned, I do not intend to make a speech. I do remind the Senate that the bill provides \$1,800,000,000 less than the amount appropriated last year, and approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars less than the President requested. So I shall talk only about amendments that are objected to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the procedure outlined by the Senator from South Carolina will be followed. Then we will know what the debate will cover, and what we shall have to discuss. At least a part of the bill will be out of the way. I hope that procedure will be followed.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to inquire if we could agree by unanimous consent to limit debate upon this bill. I should like to see debate limited to 1 hour on the housing amendments, and 1 hour on the other amendment the Senator from South Carolina mentioned.

Mr. MAYBANK. The amendment affecting the TVA steam plants.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to see debate limited to 1 hour on that amendment. That would be 30 minutes to a side. Then I would propose a limitation of 30 minutes on all other amendments.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would have no objection to that, because I understand the mind of every member of the committee is pretty well made up. However, I would not suggest what the Senate should do.

Further, as the TVA amendment, I understood from the chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee—and if I am wrong, I hope the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] will correct me—that the members of his legislative committee first thought the appropriation should be \$800,000. The Appropriations Committee made it \$600,000, and I understood that that was acceptable, certainly to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That was acceptable, except that one member of our committee did not join us in our request.

Mr. MAYBANK. Why not limit the debate on housing amendments to 1 hour to each side?

Mr. McFARLAND. I had suggested 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, am I to understand that the debate on housing amendments will be limited to 1 hour to each side?

Mr. McFARLAND. If that is what everyone wants, then I shall have no objection.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think, in view of the tremendous pressure there is upon all Senators, it should be an hour to each side.

Mr. McFARLAND. How much time is desired on the TVA amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. Whatever the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee suggests. I intend to turn over to the Senator from Tennessee whatever time I do not use.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well. I ask unanimous consent that on the pending bill there be a limitation of debate of 1 hour to a side upon any amendment involving housing, the time to be controlled by the proponents of the amendments and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], in the event he is opposed to the amendment, and in the event he is in favor of the amendment, then the time to be controlled by the distinguished minority leader.

On the TVA amendment, I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation of debate of 1 hour, 30 minutes to each side, the time to be controlled.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. McFARLAND. I see we are going to be here until 1 or 2 o'clock in the morning. If that is the wish of the Senate, we can do it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Oh, no; I think we can work this out harmoniously. Let us have an hour to each side. So far as the TVA is concerned, I intend to turn the time over to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will make it 1 hour to each side, but that will run into a long time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will request the Senator from Arizona to restate the agreement he requests.

Mr. McFARLAND. If I can get the floor, I will endeavor to restate the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall now endeavor to restate the unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that there be a limitation on the debate on the pending bill as follows: Two hours on any amendment in the housing portion of the bill, to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] in the event he is opposed to the amendment; and in the event he favors the amendment, then by the minority leader, or any Senator he may designate.

Two hours upon the TVA amendment, if one is offered, the time to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina in the event he is opposed to the amendment; and if he is in favor of the amendment, then by the minority leader or any Senator he may designate.

On all other amendments, 30 minutes, to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me finish the unanimous-consent request.

I also ask unanimous consent that the time for debate on the bill be limited to 1 hour, to be controlled equally by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and the minority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona ask that all amendments be germane?

Mr. McFARLAND. I include in the request that all amendments must be germane.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not quite clear what disposition the Senator proposes to make with regard to amendments offered from the floor. Is the time to be half an hour, 15 minutes to a side, or some other length of time?

Mr. McFARLAND. With respect to amendments offered to the housing portion of the bill, there will be an hour to each side. With respect to the TVA amendment, there will be an hour to each side. On all other amendments there will be 15 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Chair to understand that the majority leader wishes to include motions and appeals?

Mr. McFARLAND. On all motions or appeals, 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to make clear what is meant by an amendment to the TVA portion of the bill. Would a proposal to strike out a provision already in the bill be considered an amendment? In other words, when the Senator from Arizona uses the word "amendment" in connection with the TVA provision, does that mean that the limitation would apply to the debate which might arise in connection with a proposal to strike out a provision already in the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. That would be an amendment, as I understand.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to submit a resolution which I think is of great importance, in the light of the Supreme Court decision in the Steel case. I wonder whether or not the proposed unanimous-consent agreement would preclude me from having that opportunity. I do not wish to submit it tomorrow. I wish to submit it today.

Mr. MAYBANK. How much time would the Senator require?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think I can finish in 15 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am agreeable to the Senator from Minnesota having 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if I may have the opportunity to place two or three small items in the Record, I shall not object to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. I expect to yield to Senators before the request is sub-

mitted. Perhaps we can dispose of the Senator from Nevada in a few minutes.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall be glad to yield in just a moment.

I now yield to the Senator from Nevada.

(At this point Mr. McFARLAND yielded to Mr. McCARRAN, who submitted several matters for printing in the Record, which will be found under appropriate headings elsewhere in the Record.)

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. In a moment. As a part of the unanimous-consent request which I am submitting, I am about to ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to make insertions in the Record.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President—

Mr. McFARLAND. If the Senator will give me an opportunity, I should like to have the unanimous-consent request disposed of while there is a good attendance of Senators in the Chamber.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask one question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Washington expects to raise a point of order against a particular paragraph in the bill. He will need very little time. How much time will he be entitled to use to explain and defend his point of order?

Mr. McFARLAND. How much time does the Senator desire? I think the limitation of 15 minutes to a side would apply.

Mr. CAIN. That is entirely satisfactory to me. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Also, there would be a limitation of 15 minutes to a side on all amendments to amendments.

I also include in the unanimous-consent request the provision that immediately following the agreement of the Senate to the unanimous-consent request, Senators be permitted to make insertions in the Record, and, if they have brief statements, that they be allowed not to exceed 5 minutes to make them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE CURRENT STEEL DISPUTE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution and to speak on it for not exceeding 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is this the 15-minute period which the Senator from Minnesota mentioned previously?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I would rather take the time now than when the Senate is considering the appropriation bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection, but I hope that the Senator will take 10 minutes

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 5, 1952
For actions of June 4, 1952
S2nd-2nd, No. 96

CONTENTS

Accounting.....14	Flood control.....18	Parity formula.....2
Administrative procedure...13	Flood rehabilitation.....18	Personnel.....11
Appropriations.....6,9,18	Foreign aid.....7,15	Price control.....1
Beans.....12	Fruits and vegetables.....1	Purchasing.....4
Defense production.....1	Government control.....17	Road authorizations.....8
Electrification.....16	Immigration.....5	Trade, foreign.....12
Emergency powers.....10,19	Import control.....1	Wage control.....1
Extension work.....3		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated defense production bill agreeing to exempt fresh fruits and vegetables from price control. Senate committee reported bill to extend dual parity on basic commodities for 2 years. Senate committee ordered reported bill to adjust extension-work authorizations in view of new census. House deferred consideration of conference report on 3rd supplemental appropriation bill until Thurs. House conferees appointed on road authorizations bill. President approved flood-rehabilitation appropriation measure.

SENATE

1. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Continued debate on S. 2594, to amend and extend the Defense Production Act (pp. 6603-32).

Amendments agreed to included the following:

- By Sen. Holland, providing that no price ceiling shall be established or maintained on fresh fruits or vegetables (pp. 6672-4).
- By Sen. Fulbright, providing for judicial review of Labor Department decisions under the Public Contracts Act (pp. 6638-41).
- By Sen. Ferguson, to prevent use of this legislation to implement decisions of the International Materials Conference, by a 43-40 vote (pp. 6645-59).

Amendments rejected included the following:

- By Sen. Capehart, to suspend price-wage controls unless the consumer index rises 3 points, by a 23-57 vote (pp. 6659-62).
- By Sen. Dirksen, to suspend price controls on agricultural and fish products not in short supply, by a 33-40 vote (pp. 6662-4).
- By Sen. Mundt, to provide for import controls on oats, rye, barley, and wheat, by a 36-46 vote (pp. 6664-9).
- By Sen. Dirksen, prohibiting price control on agricultural products, by a 29-49 vote (pp. 6674-7).
- By Sen. Aiken, authorizing some flexibility in administration of the import-control provision, by a 36-38 vote (pp. 6677-9).

2. PARITY FORMULA. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 2115, to continue the existing parity formula for basic commodities until Jan. 1, 1956 (S. Rept. 1674)(p. 6603).

3. EXTENSION WORK. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 6773, to adjust extension-work authorizations, with

an amendment which, the "Daily Digest" states, "would freeze extension funds in the fiscal year 1953 in the same manner as they were allocated in fiscal 1952" (p. D538).

4. PURCHASING. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendments S. 2487, to permit judicial review of decisions of Government contracting officers involving questions of fact arising under Government contracts in cases other than those in which fraud is alleged (H. Rept. 1670)(pp. 6602-3).
5. IMMIGRATION. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendment S. Res. 326, to investigate problems connected with emigration of refugees from Western European nations (S. Rept. 1671)(p. 6603).
6. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953. Sen. Anderson submitted an amendment which he intends to propose to this bill, H. R. 7314 (p. 6606):

HOUSE

7. FOREIGN AID. Conferees filed their report on H. R. 7005, to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (H. Rept. 2031). The total authorization agreed upon was \$6,447,730,750 which was reached by dividing equally the amounts previously authorized by both Houses. A total of \$4,598,424,500 is for military assistance and \$1,805,288,500 is for economic and technical assistance. The conferees agreed to the Senate amendment providing for carry-over of unexpended balances, and eliminated a House provision limiting dollar expenditures under the act for supplies, equipment, and commodities in the technical assistance program. The conferees also expect the Administrator of TCA to cut to reasonable levels all "staffs in Washington concerned with Point 4." The conferees included language to insure that small business will share equitably in the TCA programs, and agreed that \$16,481,000 be contributed to the WICOM but that in no case should this Country's contribution exceed more than one-third of contributions from all other governments. (pp. 6684-91.)

3. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. Reps. Fallon, Trimble, Dempsey, Jones (Ala.), Dondero, McGregor, and Angell were appointed as conferees on H. R. 7340, authorizing appropriations for road construction in 1954 and 1955 (p. 6683). Senate conferees were appointed June 3.

9. THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952. Consideration of the conference report on this bill, H. R. 6947, was deferred until Thursday when a point of order regarding presence of a quorum was raised by Rep. Fisher (p. 6691).

10. EMERGENCY POWERS. The "Daily Digest" states that "Agreement was reached on the Emergency Powers Continuation Act, and an amended bill will be introduced and reported favorably to the House" (p. D540).

11. PERSONNEL. Received from this Department a proposed bill to establish an additional Assistant Secretary of Agriculture and an Administrative Assistant Secretary, to authorize the Secretary to delegate his functions, and to require a periodic review by the Secretary of the management of the Department (p. 6694).

12. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Taber criticized the State Department's recent action in entering into an agreement with Chile and Cuba giving Chile a large share of the American colored dried bean market in Cuba without consulting the farmers (p. 6690).

Rep. Hill also spoke on this subject and claimed the State Department is giving away our foreign markets while the CCC owns over 4,500,000 bags of dried beans which he claimed will have "to be given away later in exchange for token payments" (pp. 6690-1).

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued June 8, 1952

For actions of June 5, 1952

2nd-2nd, No. 97

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....19	Immigration.....29	Road authorizations.....13
Appropriations...1,3,14,36	Labor, farm.....1,7	Rubber.....15
Budgeting.....35	Lands, public.....8,17,18	St. Lawrence Waterway.....30
Cotton parity.....11	Lands, reclamation.....24	School lunch program.....5
Dairy industry.....28	Loans, farm.....4,9	Soil conservation.....27
Defense production...2,25	Nomination.....4	Surplus commodities.....3
Education.....20	Organization, executive.21	Taxation.....31
Emergency powers....16,26	Personnel.....1,6,23	Transportation.....23
Foreign aid.....10,22,34	Price control.....2	Veterans' benefits.....12,32
Forestry.....1,33	Price support.....11	Water utilization.....27

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on 3rd supplemental appropriation bill. Senate debated defense production bill. Senate made agricultural appropriation bill its unfinished business. Senate received nomination of Duggan to FCA. Senate committee reported bill to increase school lunch funds for territories and possessions. House adopted conference report on foreign aid bill. House passed cotton parity standard bill. House passed Korean veterans' G. I. bill. Conferees agreed on report for road authorization bill.

SENATE

1. **THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952.** Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 6947, and acted on amendments which had been reported in disagreement. The bill was then sent to the President. . The House agreed to the Senate amendment providing \$300 pay increases for certain \$14,000 officials. The House also agreed to the provision that the snack-jumper facilities item be the total cost of the project. The House reduced the item for Civil Service Commission investigations to \$4,000,000, and the Senate concurred in this action. In addition to the items listed in Digest 95, the bill, as finally passed, also contains an item of \$4,000,000 (Senate figure) for the Immigration and Naturalization Service which is largely for the Mexican farm-labor program. During House debate, Rep. Fisher moved that the bill be recommitted to conference with instructions that the House conferees insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment increasing the amount for the farm-labor program, but this motion was rejected, 35-149. (pp. 6709, 6747-56.)
2. **DEFENSE PRODUCTION.** Continued debate on S. 2594, to continue and amend the Defense Production Act (pp. 6702-10, 6712-39). Rejected, 27-54, a Dirksen amendment barring price ceilings after Sept. 1, 1952, on any material or service unless it is in short supply or threatens inflation (pp. 6703-6). Voted, 42-38, in favor of a McFarland motion to postpone debate on this bill until Mon., June 9, after Sen. Byrd had presented an amendment advising the President to use the Taft-Hartley Act in connection with the steel strike.

3. **AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1953.** This bill, H. R. 7314, was made the unfinished business (pp. 6740, 6742). Sen. Douglas gave notice that he will move to suspend the rules and offer an amendment which would make Sec. 32 of the Act of Aug. 24, 1935 (relating to disposal of surplus commodities) merely an authorization rather than a permanent appropriation. In addition, Sens. Williams, Case, and Douglas submitted various amendments which they intend to propose to the bill. (p. 6701.)
4. **NOMINATION.** Received the nomination of Ivy W. Duggan to be Governor of FCA for 6 years from June 15, 1952 (p. 6744).
5. **SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM.** The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported with amendments H. R. 1732, to increase the school lunch program allotments for the territories and possessions (S. Rept. 1677) (p. 6698).
6. **PERSONNEL.** The Rules and Administration Committee reported with amendments S. 3061, to permit and assist Federal personnel and their families to exercise their voting franchise (S. Rept. 1675) (p. 6698).
7. **MIGRATORY LABOR.** The Labor and Public Welfare Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) a new bill to establish a Federal Commission on Migratory Labor (p. D544).
8. **PUBLIC LANDS; TAXATION.** Sen. Humphrey inserted a Minneapolis City Council resolution favoring additional Federal payments in lieu of taxes on public lands (p. 6697).
9. **FARM CREDIT.** Sen. Humphrey inserted a Fergus Falls Production Credit Association resolution favoring legislation to make the cooperative farm credit system more independent of the Federal Government (pp. 6697-8).

HOUSE

10. **FOREIGN AID.** Adopted the conference report on H. R. 7005, to amend the Mutual Security Act of 1951 (pp. 6774-78).
11. **COTTON PARITY.** Passed, 156-62, as reported H. R. 5713, providing that Low Middling seven-eighth-inch cotton shall be the standard grade for determining parity and price support for the 1952 cotton crop if this Department makes an official estimate that the 1952 crop will equal or exceed 16 million bales. This bill is designed to protect farmers against a disastrous price decline if they produce 16 million bales or more in 1952. (pp. 6751-4.)
12. **VETERANS' BENEFITS.** Passed, 361-1, as reported H. R. 7656, authorizing educational and training allowances for Korean veterans. The bill also provides home, farm, and business loan credit assistance, old age and survivors' insurance credits, and employment assistance. (pp. 6759-61.)
13. **ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS.** Conferees on H. R. 7340, authorizing appropriations for road construction in 1954 and 1955, agreed to file (but did not actually file) a conference report. The "Daily Digest" states that the conferees agreed to an annual total of \$550 million for Federal aid to highway systems for each of the fiscal years. (p. D547.)
14. **APPROPRIATIONS.** Agreed to conferences with the Senate on the following bills:
H. R. 6854, Treasury-Post Office Appropriation bill for 1953, appointing as conferees Reps. Gary, Fernandez, Passman, Sieminski, Cannon, Canfield, Wilson (Ind.), James, and Taber. (p. 6745). Senate conferees were appointed April 29.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY
1100 EAST 58TH STREET
CHICAGO, ILL. 60637

a
1

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Issued June 11, 1952

For actions of June 10, 1952

62nd-2nd, No. 100

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Administrative procedure.....10	Flood control.....21	Price maintenance.....6
Appropriations.....5	Food prices.....14	Price support.....16,18
Budgeting.....25	Forestry.....8,11,22	Puerto Rico.....4
Claims.....5	Immigration.....7	Reclamation.....3,9,17
Copper.....26	Irrigation.....28	Road authorizations.....8
Defense production.....1	Lands, transfer.....11,29	St. Lawrence seaway.....24
Education.....1,15,27	Personnel.....13	Tobacco.....16
Electrification.....2,20	Potatoes.....19	Veterans' benefits.....23
Emergency powers.....12	Price control.....26	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated defense production bill. House adopted conference report on immigration revision bill. House received conference report on road-authorization bill.

SENATE

1. DEFENSE PRODUCTION. Continued debate on S. 2594, to extend the Defense Production Act, considering amendments relating to the steel strike (pp. 7063-66).
2. ELECTRIFICATION. Concurred in the House amendment to S. 97, authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydro-electric power at the Cheatham Dam, Tenn. (p. 7063). This bill will now be sent to the President.
3. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments H. R. 2813, to authorize the Interior Department to construct, operate, and maintain the Colibran reclamation project, Colo. (S. Rept. 1719)(p. 7051).
4. PUERTO RICO. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendments S. J. Res. 151, approving the constitution of Puerto Rico (S. Rept. 1720)(p. 7051).
5. APPROPRIATIONS; CLAIMS. Received from the President a supplemental appropriation estimate to pay claims for damages, audited claims, and judgments against the Government; to Appropriations Committee (S. Doc. 144)(p. 7047).
6. PRICE MAINTENANCE. Sen. Morse inserted a Washington Post editorial criticizing the so-called fair trade bill (pp. 7047-8).

HOUSE

7. IMMIGRATION. Adopted, 203-53, the conference report on H. R. 5676, to revise the immigration and naturalization laws (pp. 7109-13).

8. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 7340, authorizing appropriations for road construction in the fiscal years 1954 and 1955. The conferees agreed to authorize \$550,000,000 for 1954 and 1955, allotting 45% or \$247,500,000 of this amount for the Federal-aid primary system, 30% or \$165,000,000 for the Federal-aid secondary system, and 25% or \$137,500,000 for the primary system in urban areas. They also agreed to the House authorization for the Federal-aid highway system and the 2-year grace period for matching funds. They also agreed on a compromise figure of \$25,000,000 for each year for interstate highways. The conferees agreed to authorize \$22,500,000 for forest highways, and the House conferees accepted the \$22,500,000 for forest-development roads and trails contained in the Senate amendment with the understanding that not less than \$5,000,000 of this amount will be applied to timber-access roads. The House conferees agreed to a Senate amendment authorizing \$50,000,000, in lieu of the House authorization of \$12,000,000 for access roads to timber and mineral resources, to be applied to all types of defense access roads. The conferees agreed in a reduction from \$5,000,000 to \$2,500,000 for public lands roads (H. Rept. 2132) (pp. 708-2). The "Daily Digest" states that the House will act on this report on Wed. (p. D564.)
9. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported (but did not actually report) S. 2610, providing that excess-land provisions of Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to certain lands receiving water from the San Luis Valley project, Colo., and S. 2646, to cancel irrigation maintenance and operation charges on the Shoshone Indian Mission School lands on the Wind River Indian Reservation (p. D565).
10. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE. The Judiciary Committee reported with amendment S. 1770, to amend the Administrative Procedure Act and to eliminate certain exemptions therefrom (H. Rept. 2133) (p. 7121).
11. LAND TRANSFER. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment S. 1536, to stabilize the economy of New Mex. residents on the North Lobato and El Pueblo tracts and to transfer such lands to the Forest Service (H. Rept. 2134) (p. 7124).
12. EMERGENCY POWERS. The Rules Committee reported a resolution providing for consideration of H. J. Res. 477, to continue certain emergency powers for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, through June 30, 1953 (pp. 7113, 7124). The "Daily Digest" states the House will consider this measure on Wed. (p. D564.)
13. PERSONNEL. Received from the Civil Service Commission a draft of a bill "to amend the Classification Act of 1949, as amended"; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee (p. 7124).
14. FOOD PRICES. Rep. Marshall inserted a St. Paul Pioneer Press article explaining that food costs have "more than tripled since prewar days" because of increases in farm prices and improvements in the amounts and kinds of food served (p. 7114).

BILLS INTRODUCED

15. EDUCATION. H. R. 8145, by Rep. Bailex, to improve and extend financial assistance for local educational agencies in areas affected by Federal activities; to Education and Labor Committee (p. 7125).
16. TOBACCO. H. R. 8150, by Rep. Sasser, to provide price support for the 1952 crop of Maryland tobacco; to Agriculture Committee (p. 7125).

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1952

JUNE 10, 1952.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. FALLON, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 7340]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert *That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$550,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.*

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) *\$247,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.*

(b) *\$165,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.*

(c) *\$137,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas.*

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the

Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this Act.*

SEC. 2. *For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of Federal-aid primary funds: Provided, That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be determined in the same manner as now provided by law for projects on said Federal-aid primary system.*

SEC. 3. *For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: Provided, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: And be it further provided, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.*

SEC. 4. (a) *For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.*

(b) *For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a*

like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: Provided, That the limitation of \$13,000,000 on the cost of construction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway prescribed by the Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 400), is hereby increased to \$14,500,000 and the additional sum of \$1,500,000 hereby authorized shall be available for contract immediately upon the passage of this Act.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: Provided, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Commissioner of Public Roads.

SEC. 5. Recognizing the mutual benefits that will accrue to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States from the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in said Republic of Nicaragua, the construction of which road was begun and partially completed pursuant to an agreement between said Republic and the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, for completing the construction of such road, to be available until expended. No expenditure shall be made hereunder for the construction of said road until a request therefor shall have been received by the Secretary of State from the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua nor until an agreement shall have been entered into by said Republic with the Secretary of State which shall provide, in part, that said Republic—

(1) will provide, without participation of funds herein authorized, all necessary right-of-way for the construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall be of a minimum width where practicable of one hundred meters in rural areas and fifty meters in municipalities and shall forever be held inviolate as a part of the highway for public use;

(2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit any such toll to be charged for the use of said highway by vehicles or persons;

(3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly, any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of said road by vehicles or persons from the United States that does not apply equally to vehicles or persons of such Republic;

(4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance with the provisions of the Convention for the Regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington on December 15, 1943, and to which such Republic and the United States are parties; or any other treaty or international convention establishing similar reciprocal recognition; and

(5) will maintain said road after its completion in proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.

(b) The funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the terms of this Act for the survey and construction of the said road from San Benito to Rama and for the survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff

in the Republic of Nicaragua without being matched by said Republic, and all expenditures made under the provisions of this Act for materials, equipment, and supplies, shall, whenever practicable, be made for products of the United States or of the Republic of Nicaragua.

SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway" approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount or \$10,000,000 for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, after receipt of an application therefor from the highway department of any State, in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid highway systems, which he shall find have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, landslides, or other catastrophes in any part of the United States. The appropriation of such moneys as may be necessary for the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized: Provided, That, pending the appropriation of said sum, or its replenishment, the Commissioner of Public Roads may expend, from existing Federal-aid highway appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: Provided further, That no expenditures shall be made hereunder with respect to any such catastrophe in any State unless an emergency has been declared by the Governor of such State and concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce: And provided further, That the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made available under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof.

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 9. The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized and directed to assist in carrying out the action program of the President's Highway Safety Conference and to cooperate with the State highway departments and other agencies in this program to advance the cause of safety on the streets and highways: Provided, That not to exceed \$150,000 shall be expended annually for the purposes of this section.

SEC. 10. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$50,000,000 to remain available until expended: Provided, That whenever any project for the construction or improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, as being important for civilian or military defense, such project may be constructed under the authorization in this section and in accordance with the conditions contained therein: And be it further provided, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road under the authority contained in this section, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction.

SEC. 11. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950, not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 12. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 13. That all Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed, and this Act shall take effect on its passage.

SEC. 14. This Act may be cited as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952.

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JAMES W. TRIMBLE,
JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
ROBERT E. JONES, Jr.,
GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
HOMER D. ANGELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ROBERT S. KERR,
HARRY P. CAIN,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Highway Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

The Senate struck all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted in lieu thereof an amendment which was a complete substitute for the text of the House bill. However, the provisions of the House bill and the Senate amendment were in large part identical. The following statement indicates the differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment and the action of the conferees with respect to these differences.

BILL AS AGREED CARRIES AMOUNTS IN HOUSE BILL FOR PRIMARY, SECONDARY, AND PRIMARY ROADS IN URBAN AREAS

Section 1 of the conference agreement and section 1 of the House bill authorize \$550,000,000 for appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1954, and June 30, 1955, on the basis of 45 percent for the Federal-aid primary system, 30 percent for the Federal-aid secondary system, and 25 percent for the Federal-aid urban system, thus authorizing \$247,500,000 for the primary highway system, \$165,000,000 for the secondary highway system, and \$137,500,000 for the primary system in urban areas.

The House conferees prevailed upon the Senate conferees to agree to the House authorizations for the Federal-aid highway system and the House conferees further prevailed upon the Senate conferees to accept the 2-year grace period for matching funds provided for in the House bill in lieu of the 18-month period in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment did not carry any provision relative to permission to transfer up to 25 percent of the primary and secondary funds in either direction and after conference the House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment in this respect.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Section 2 of the Senate amendment authorized the sum of \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, for projects on the interstate highway system. No such authorization was contained in the House bill and the conferees finally compromised on the sum of \$25,000,000 for each fiscal year.

FOREST HIGHWAYS, FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

The conferees agreed to the authorization of \$22,500,000 for forest highways in lieu of \$22,000,000 authorized by the House bill and \$25,000,000 authorized in the Senate amendment.

▶ The House conferees accepted the authorization of \$22,500,000 for forest-development roads and trails contained in the Senate amendment with the understanding that not less than \$5,000,000 of this amount will be applied to timber-access roads, as stated in the Senate committee report on S. 2437.

PARK SERVICE ROADS, PARKWAYS, AND INDIAN ROADS

The only difference between the House and Senate versions with respect to section 4 was the provision in the House bill to increase the authorization for the Baltimore-Washington Parkway to \$14,500,000, an increase of \$1,500,000. The Senate amendment did not contain this provision and the Senate conferees agreed to its inclusion.

RAMA ROAD

Section 5 of the House bill provided funds for construction of the Rama Road. The Senate amendment did not contain such a provision and the Senate conferees agreed to its inclusion.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

The Senate amendment provided an authorization of \$56,000,000 to complete this project. The Senate conferees agreed to the House version providing for \$8,000,000 for each of two fiscal years, reducing the total authorization by \$40,000,000. The House conferees accepted certain technical drafting improvements.

EMERGENCY FUND

The Senate amendment carried an authorization of \$15,000,000 for an emergency fund. The 1950 act carried a similar provision. The Senate language, therefore, is in effect a reauthorization of the previous emergency fund to establish it upon an annual replenishment basis. The House version had no such provision but the conferees agreed to its inclusion with a reduction of the annual limit of expenditure from \$15,000,000 to \$10,000,000. Since under the 1950 act there remains a balance of \$8,000,000 in the emergency fund, the new language in effect results in an increase of only \$2,000,000 at the present time.

PUBLIC LANDS ROADS

Section 8 of the conference agreement (Sec. 7 of the Senate amendment) is the same as section 10 of the 1950 act but with the authorization reduced from \$5,000,000 to \$2,500,000. There was no such authorization in the House bill. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment with respect to this section.

HIGHWAY SAFETY CONFERENCE

The House version authorized \$200,000 annually for the President's Highway Safety Conference. The Senate amendment authorized \$100,000 annually for the same purpose and the conferees agreed to an authorization of \$150,000.

DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS

The House bill authorized the sum of \$12,000,000 for access roads to timber and mineral resources with the expectation that the subject needs for defense access roads generally would be considered in separate legislation. The Senate amendment authorized the sum of \$50,000,000 to be applied generally to all types of defense access roads. The Senate felt that it was too late in the session to hold this matter up for separate legislation. Its authorization was, therefore, based upon consideration of the entire subject of defense access roads generally. The House conferees took into consideration that there would have to be separate legislation if the matter was not included in the manner in which the Senate had provided for it in its amendment. In agreeing to the Senate amendment the House conferees felt that the subject of access roads to timber and mineral resources, as provided for in the House bill, was adequately covered in the language with respect to forest-development roads and trails appearing in the Senate Report S. 2437.

There was no disagreement among the conferees on the remaining sections (secs. 10, 11, 12, and 13) of the Senate amendment.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JAMES W. TRIMBLE,
JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
ROBERT E. JONES, Jr.,
GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
HOMER D. ANGELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.



Taft-Hartley Act, but without going through the formality of appointing a board of inquiry and waiting for its report.

I do not recommend that the Congress adopt the Taft-Hartley approach. I think it would be unwise, unfair, and quite possibly ineffective.

The Nation has already had the benefit of whatever could be gained by action under the Taft-Hartley Act. That act provides for two main things. It provides for a fact-finding board to investigate and report on the issues in dispute. In the steel case, we have already had the facts fully determined and reported by the Wage Stabilization Board. The Taft-Hartley Act also provides for injunctions against a shutdown for a total of 80 days. In the steel case the union already, even before April 8, had voluntarily postponed strike action for 99 days. Insofar as fact-finding and delay are concerned, therefore, the practical effects of the Taft-Hartley Act were achieved in this case some time ago.

Over and above these facts, however, there are other compelling reasons for not using an injunction of the Taft-Hartley type in the steel case. Its effect would be to require the workers to continue working for another long period without change in their wages and working conditions. This would be grossly unfair. The Wage Stabilization Board, the Government agency charged with responsibility in these matters, has found—and the companies have admitted—that the workers are entitled to improvements in wages and working conditions. The union members stayed at work, at Government request, during the time the case was being considered by the Wage Board, and later during the period of Government operation from April 8 to June 2. In these respects, the union and its members have cooperated fully with the Government in the public interest. And yet the effect of a Taft-Hartley labor injunction would be to penalize the workers and to give the advantage to the steel companies. I want to make it very plain to the Congress that the result of using a Taft-Hartley type injunction in this dispute would be to take sides with the companies and against the workers.

Furthermore, a Taft-Hartley injunction would take away management's incentive to bargain out the issues in dispute. The companies would have nothing to lose and everything to gain by delaying an agreement for as long as the injunction was in effect. Thus a Taft-Hartley injunction in this case would not only be unfair, it would hamper, rather than help, the collective bargaining negotiations.

Moreover, use of the Taft-Hartley law would not guarantee a restoration of full-scale steel production, which should be our primary objective. Nothing in the act can restore steel production immediately or automatically. As the Congress knows, the first step that must be taken under that act is to appoint a board of inquiry to investigate and report the facts of the matter. Previous experience indicates that it could take as much as a week or 10 days for such a board to com-

plete its task. If such a board were appointed and made its report, and the Attorney General were directed to seek an injunction against a strike, the question would arise whether a court of equity would grant the Attorney General's request, in view of the union's previous voluntary 99-day postponement. Furthermore, even if an injunction were granted, there is no assurance that it would get the steel mills back in operation. I call the attention of the Congress to the fact that such an injunction did not get the coal mines back in operation in 1950.

If, however, the judgment of the Congress, contrary to mine, is that an injunction of the Taft-Hartley type should be used, there is a quicker way to do so than by appointing a board of inquiry under the Taft-Hartley Act. That would be for the Congress to enact legislation authorizing and directing the President to seek such an injunction, without waiting for any board to be appointed and to report.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I believe the Taft-Hartley procedure would be unfair, harmful, and futile—futile at least in helping to bring about a settlement, and perhaps also in restoring production. I hope very much that the Congress will decide that the Taft-Hartley type injunction should not be used at all and that seizure legislation should be enacted instead.

In any event, I hope the Congress will act quickly. The issue of peace or war hangs in the balance, and steel is a vital element in the outcome.

We are engaged, with other free countries, in a mighty effort to build up the military defenses of the free world. We must build up this military strength if we are to have a reasonable chance of preventing world war III. But we cannot do it without steel, for steel is the backbone of our defense production, and, indeed, of our whole industrial society.

Every action I have taken in the dispute in the steel industry, beginning last December, has been based on the paramount necessity for maintaining the production of essential steel products in the present defense emergency. When I took the extraordinary step of seizure in the absence of specific statutory authority, I pointed out that "with American troops facing the enemy on the field of battle, I would not be living up to my oath of office if I failed to do whatever is required to provide them with the weapons and ammunition they need for their survival." Now a majority of the Supreme Court have declared that I cannot take the action I believe necessary. But they have said very clearly that the Congress can.

Whatever may have been the intention of the Court's majority in setting limits on the President's powers, there can be no question of their view that the Congress can enact legislation to avoid a crippling work stoppage in the steel industry. Mr. Justice Black said the Congress "can authorize the taking of private property for public use. It can make laws regulating the relationships between employers and employees, prescribing rules designed to settle labor

disputes, and fixing wages and working conditions." Mr. Justice Frankfurter said that by enacting the Taft-Hartley Act, the Congress in effect decided that "the only recourse for preventing a shutdown in any basic industry after failure of mediation, was Congress." Mr. Justice Jackson referred to "the ease, expedition and safety with which Congress can grant" emergency powers of the type needed to handle this crisis.

The issue is squarely up to the Congress. I hope the Congress will meet it by enacting fair and effective legislation. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m., the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The members of the President's Cabinet retired.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House will stand in recess until 1:30 o'clock p. m., the bells to be rung at 1:15 p. m.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 1:30 p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.

REFERENCE OF PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President delivered to the joint session of the House and Senate, be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have permission to sit during general debate in sessions of the House this afternoon.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 min-

utes today, following the special orders heretofore entered.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Record of June 9, page 7040, be corrected as follows:

In the third column, the second and third lines from the bottom, strike out the words "the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN]."

Tenth line from the bottom, change the word "we" to "I"; and strike out the word "in" as well as the word "ourselves" and in place of the word "ourselves" insert "myself delayed waiting for."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Record will be corrected as indicated.

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID TO HIGHWAYS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

(The conference report and statement follow:)

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2132)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$550,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

"The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

"(a) \$247,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

"(b) \$165,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

"(c) \$137,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas.

"The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of

the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

"Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this Act.

"SEC. 2. For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of Federal-aid primary funds: *Provided*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be determined in the same manner as now provided by law for projects on said Federal-aid primary system.

"SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *And be it further provided*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

"SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

"(b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the limitation of \$13,000,000 on the cost of construction of the Baltimore-

Washington Parkway prescribed by the Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 400), is hereby increased to \$14,500,000 and the additional sum of \$1,500,000 hereby authorized shall be available for contract immediately upon the passage of this Act.

"(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Commissioner of Public Roads.

"SEC. 5. Recognizing the mutual benefits that will accrue to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States from the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in said Republic of Nicaragua, the construction of which road was begun and partially completed pursuant to an agreement between said Republic and the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, for completing the construction of such road, to be available until expended. No expenditure shall be made hereunder for the construction of said road until a request therefor shall have been received by the Secretary of State from the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua nor until an agreement shall have been entered into by said Republic with the Secretary of State which shall provide, in part, that said Republic—

"(1) will provide, without participation of funds herein authorized, all necessary right-of-way for the construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall be of a minimum width where practicable of one hundred meters in rural areas and fifty meters in municipalities and shall forever be held inviolate as a part of the highway for public use;

"(2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit any such toll to be charged for the use of said highway by vehicles or persons;

"(3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly, any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of said road by vehicles or persons from the United States that does not apply equally to vehicles or persons of such Republic;

"(4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance with the provisions of the Convention for the Regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington on December 15, 1943, and to which such Republic and the United States are parties; or any other treaty or international convention establishing similar reciprocal recognition; and

"(5) will maintain said road after its completion in proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.

"(b) The funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the terms of this Act for the survey and construction of the said road from San Benito to Rama and for the survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff in the Republic of Nicaragua without being matched by said Republic, and all expenditures made under the provisions of this Act for materials, equipment, and supplies, shall, whenever practicable, be made for products of the United States or of the Republic of Nicaragua.

"SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 1 of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway' approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear.

"SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of \$10,000,000 for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, after receipt of an application therefor from the highway department of any State, in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid highway systems, which he shall find have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, landslides, or other catastrophes in any part of the United States. The appropriation of such moneys as may be necessary for the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That, pending the appropriation of said sum, or its replenishment, the Commissioner of Public Roads may expend, from existing Federal-aid highway appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That no expenditures shall be made hereunder with respect to any such catastrophe in any State unless an emergency has been declared by the Governor of such State and concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce: *And provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made available under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof.

"SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, non-taxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, to remain available until expended.

"SEC. 9. The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized and directed to assist in carrying out the action program of the President's Highway Safety Conference and to cooperate with the State highway departments and other agencies in this program to advance the cause of safety on the streets and highways: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$150,-

000 shall be expended annually for the purposes of this section.

"SEC. 10. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$50,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That whenever any project for the construction or improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, as being important for civilian or military defense, such project may be constructed under the authorization in this section and in accordance with the conditions contained therein: *And it be further provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road under the authority contained in this section, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction.

"SEC. 11. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950, not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain in full force and effect.

"SEC. 12. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

"SEC. 13. That all Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed, and this Act shall take effect on its passage.

"SEC. 14. This Act may be cited as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952."

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JAMES W. TRIMBLE,
JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
ROBERT E. JONES, JR.,
GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
HOMER D. ANGELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
ROBERT S. KERR,
HARRY P. CAIN,
FRANCIS CASE,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal Aid Highway Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

The Senate struck all after the enacting clause of the House bill and inserted in lieu thereof an amendment which was a complete substitute for the text of the House bill. However, the provisions of the House bill and the Senate amendment were in large part identical. The following statement indicates the differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment and

the action of the conferees with respect to these differences.

BILL AS AGREED CARRIES AMOUNTS IN HOUSE BILL FOR PRIMARY, SECONDARY, AND PRIMARY ROADS IN URBAN AREAS

Section 1 of the conference agreement and section 1 of the House bill authorize \$550,000,000 for appropriations for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1954, and June 30, 1955, on the basis of 45 percent for the Federal-aid primary system, 30 percent for the Federal-aid secondary system, and 25 percent for the Federal-aid urban system, thus authorizing \$247,500,000 for the primary highway system, \$165,000,000 for the secondary highway system, and \$137,500,000 for the primary system in urban areas.

The House conferees prevailed upon the Senate conferees to agree to the House authorizations for the Federal-aid highway system and the House conferees further prevailed upon the Senate conferees to accept the 2-year grace period for matching funds provided for in the House bill in lieu of the 18-month period in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment did not carry any provision relative to permission to transfer up to 25 percent of the primary and secondary funds in either direction and after conference the House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment in this respect.

INTERSTATE HIGHWAYS

Section 2 of the Senate amendment authorized the sum of \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, for projects on the interstate highway system. No such authorization was contained in the House bill and the conferees finally compromised on the sum of \$25,000,000 for each fiscal year.

FOREST HIGHWAYS, FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROADS AND TRAILS

The conferees agreed to the authorization of \$22,500,000 for forest highways in lieu of \$22,000,000 authorized by the House bill and \$25,000,000 authorized in the Senate amendment.

The House conferees accepted the authorization of \$22,500,000 for forest-development roads and trails contained in the Senate amendment with the understanding that not less than \$5,000,000 of this amount will be applied to timber-access roads, as stated in the Senate committee report on S. 2437.

PARK SERVICE ROADS, PARKWAYS AND INDIAN ROADS

The only difference between the House and Senate versions with respect to section 4 was the provision in the House bill to increase the authorization for the Baltimore-Washington Parkway to \$14,500,000, an increase of \$1,500,000. The Senate amendment did not contain this provision and the Senate conferees agreed to its inclusion.

RAMA ROAD

Section 5 of the House bill provided funds for construction of the Rama Road. The Senate amendment did not contain such a provision and the Senate conferees agreed to its inclusion.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

The Senate amendment provided an authorization of \$56,000,000 to complete this project. The Senate conferees agreed to the House version providing for \$8,000,000 for each of two fiscal years, reducing the total authorization by \$40,000,000. The House conferees accepted certain technical drafting improvements.

EMERGENCY FUND

The Senate amendment carried an authorization of \$15,000,000 for an emergency fund. The 1950 act carried a similar provision. The Senate language, therefore, is in effect a reauthorization of the previous emergency

fund to establish it upon an annual replenishment basis. The House version had no such provision but the conferees agreed to its inclusion with a reduction of the annual limit of expenditure from \$15,000,000 to \$10,000,000. Since under the 1950 act there remains a balance of \$8,000,000 in the emergency fund, the new language in effect results in an increase of only \$2,000,000 at the present time.

PUBLIC LANDS ROADS

Section 8 of the conference agreement (sec. 7 of the Senate amendment) is the same as section 10 of the 1950 act but with the authorization reduced from \$5,000,000 to \$2,500,000. There was no such authorization in the House bill. The House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment with respect to this section.

HIGHWAY SAFETY CONFERENCE

The House version authorized \$200,000 annually for the President's Highway Safety Conference. The Senate amendment authorized \$100,000 annually for the same purpose and the conferees agreed to an authorization of \$150,000.

DEFENSE ACCESS ROADS

The House bill authorized the sum of \$12,000,000 for access roads to timber and mineral resources with the expectation that the subject needs for defense access roads generally would be considered in separate legislation. The Senate amendment authorized the sum of \$50,000,000 to be applied generally to all types of defense access roads. The Senate felt that it was too late in the session to hold this matter up for separate legislation. Its authorization was, therefore, based upon consideration of the entire subject of defense access roads generally. The House conferees took into consideration that there would have to be separate legislation if the matter was not included in the manner in which the Senate had provided for it in its amendment. In agreeing to the Senate amendment the House conferees felt that the subject of access roads to timber and mineral resources, as provided for in the House bill, was adequately covered in the language with respect to forest-development roads and trails appearing in the Senate Report S. 2437.

There was no disagreement among the conferees on the remaining sections (secs. 10, 11, 12, and 13) of the Senate amendment.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JAMES W. TRIMBLE,
JOHN J. DEMPSEY,
ROBERT E. JONES, JR.,
GEO. A. DONDERO,
J. HARRY MCGREGOR,
HOMER D. ANGELL,

Managers on the Part of the House.

KOJE ISLAND

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the American people can take heart from the firm and positive steps now apparent on Kojé Island. No longer is there appeasement. No longer do American generals wait upon the demands of Communist prisoners. The Reds are now made to realize they are prisoners of war and as such if there is trouble it will be of their own making. They are treated fairly and according to the rules laid down at the Geneva Conference. That is much more than can be said for the treatment accorded Americans who are prisoners of the Reds.

The shameful spectacle of the propaganda value of American abasement before Red demands on Kojé cannot be erased. But the strong leadership of General Clark and General Boatner is helpful assurance that there will be no repetition.

I think much light was thrown on this matter by hearings held in my subcommittee on yesterday, and I call attention of the House to the fact that those hearings will be available in printed form on tomorrow.

ADDRESS OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN AT REUNION OF THE THIRTY-FIFTH DIVISION

(Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to insert at this point in the Record an address made by the President of the United States at the reunion of the Thirty-fifth Division.)

(The address follows:)

Thank you very much. Governor, I thank you very much for that wonderful introduction. I hope I can live up to it. I am very happy to be with you again. I always enjoy these reunions. In my present position, I review a lot more parades, but this is one place where I can march in one, and that's unusual.

When I was in St. Louis 2 years ago at the thirtieth reunion of the Thirty-fifth Division, I talked to you about world peace, and about the necessity of building up the defensive strength of all the free nations. A great deal has happened since then. Today, I want to talk to you about the progress we have made since 1950. And I want to point out some of the dangers that now threaten us.

When I talked to you on June 10, 1950, I told you how the Soviet Union was threatening the peace of the world. I told you that the Soviet Union was engaged in a tremendous military build-up, and that we, together with our allies, had a long, hard road ahead of us. There were a lot of things on my mind when I made that speech to you in 1950.

You remember that the Soviet Union had set off its first atomic explosion in the fall of 1949. Shortly after that, I directed the top officials of our Government to make a new study of the foreign policies and the military potential of the Soviet Union, taking into account the fact that the Soviet Union now had the secret of the atomic bomb. I directed our officials to try to find out whether the Soviet Union was headed for war, and what we should do to deter and prevent such a conflict.

These officials worked together through the new National Security Council, under my direction, and came up with their preliminary answers in April 1950. These answers presented us with some very difficult problems.

A GROWING DANGER NOTED

It seemed clear, as a result of this study, that the United States and all other free nations were faced with a great and growing danger. It seemed clear that we could meet the danger only by mobilizing our strength—and the strength of our allies—to check and deter aggression.

This meant a great military effort in time of peace. It meant doubling or tripling the budget, increasing taxes heavily, and imposing various kinds of economic controls. It meant a great change in our normal peacetime way of doing things. These were the problems that were being laid on my desk at the time I spoke to you in St. Louis in 1950.

Just 3 weeks later, the Communists invaded the Republic of Korea. That made the danger clear to everyone. The invasion of Korea demonstrated to all free nations that they had to have much stronger defenses to prevent Soviet conquest.

As a result, the free nations have been moving forward since the middle of 1950 to build bigger defenses. Our own country has taken the lead, because we are the strongest of the free nations.

We have made a lot of progress in 2 years. We have reached a number of the goals we set for ourselves back in 1950. We still have a long way to go in many respects, but if we stick to our course we can create the kind of strong, free world that we need to guarantee security and peace.

We can win peace. And we are going to win the peace. Now there's been a lot of loose talk lately to the effect that our defense program has been a failure. Much of this talk is politically inspired—the kind of talk you would expect in an election year. But I want to set the record straight. I want the people to have the facts about our defense program and our national security.

AIR FORCE NOW 91 WINGS

Let me give you some examples. Two years ago we had an Air Force of 48 wings, with 400,000 men on duty and less than 9,000 planes in active use. Now we have an Air Force of 91 wings, with almost a million men on duty and nearly 15,000 planes in active use. These figures refer to the Air Force only. They do not include the big build-up of air power in the Navy and the Marine Corps.

The goal we set in 1950 called for a 95-wing Air Force by mid-summer 1952. Ninety-one of those wings are now operating, with new and better planes coming into service all the time. Within 2 months, we expect the four remaining wings to be in operation also.

In the last 2 years, we've tooled up the aircraft industry to produce the best planes being built anywhere in the world. And we are turning them out at better than four times the pre-Korea rate.

Some of you may not realize what a great accomplishment this really is. We all remember how rapidly our factories turned out planes in World War II and we are inclined to think we should be able to do the same thing now without any trouble at all.

But the program is a very different one today. There are two main reasons for this.

The first is that the planes we are building now are far heavier, far faster, and far more complicated than those we were building 7 years ago. A new jet fighter bears about as much relation to the old P-40 as a 1952 Cadillac or Chrysler does to a model T Ford. Both planes fly, and there the similarity ends. The design, the power unit, the fire controls, and everything else are different, and far more difficult to make. And it is the same way with all our new models.

The second reason is that we are in a race for technical supremacy. The nation that freezes its models too soon will be a nation with an obsolete, inferior air force.

In World War II it was my business to investigate the construction of airplanes. At that time it took 18 months to get a plane from the drawing board off the end of the line and when that plane came off the end of the line it was obsolete. We don't want to meet a situation like that and we are not going to have.

WORK FOR BETTER PLANES

The Air Force we are building now is an Air Force of the highest quality we can possibly provide. We are concentrating on production of the very latest types of planes—and we are constantly working to design and produce even better planes.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued June 12, 1952
For actions of June 11, 1952
82nd-2nd, No. 101

CONTENTS

Credit.....17	Immigration.....2	Personnel.....20,24
Defense production...3,12,23	Information.....22	Price control.....3
Emergency powers.....5,11,21	Irrigation.....15	Reclamation.....13
Farm program.....10	Lands, grazing.....18	Road authorizations.....1
Foreign aid.....8	Lands, transfer.....6	Rubber.....6
Forestry.....1	Minerals.....23	Territory.....7,16
Grain-storage investi- gation.....9	Nomination.....4	Tobacco.....19
	Parity program.....12	Transportation.....14

HIGHLIGHTS: Both Houses agreed to conference report on road authorization bill. Ready for President. House Banking Committee voted to include in defense production bill a provision for 90% supports on basics. House passed measure continuing various emergency powers 1 year. Senate agreed to conference report on immigration revision bill. Ready for President. Senate debated defense production bill. Senate committee voted to reopen CCC grain-storage hearings and to report Duggan nomination to FCA. Sen. Ellender introduced bill for additional Assistant Secretary and Administrative Assistant Secretary of USDA. Rep. Cooley introduced bill to adjust burley tobacco allotments.

SENATE

- 1. ROAD AUTHORIZATIONS.** Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 7340, to authorize road appropriations for the fiscal years 1954 and 1955, including forest highways and forest roads and trails (pp. 7127, 7129-32, 7171-2, 7183-91). This bill will now be sent to the President.
- 2. IMMIGRATION.** Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 5678, to revise the immigration and naturalization laws (pp. 7153-6). This bill will now be sent to the President.
- 3. DEFENSE PRODUCTION.** Continued debate on S. 2594, to extend and amend the Defense Production Act (pp. 7155-63, 7166-83, 7191-7). Agreed to a Williams amendment providing that, when price control is imposed on an agricultural commodity at the farm level, OPS must impose margin controls on handlers of the commodity, at not more than their normal margins (pp. 7151-3). Agreed, 46-31, to a Fulbright amendment designed to permit continuation of the allocation of materials through the International Materials Conference (pp. 7166-81). Rejected, 33-37, a Schoepmel amendment requiring that each regulation and order on prices and wages shall be generally fair and equitable and permitting protests on ceilings on agricultural commodities (pp. 7191-5).
- 4. NOMINATION.** The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported favorably the nomination of Ivy W. Duggan to be FCA Governor (p. 7154).

5. EMERGENCY POWERS. The Judiciary Committee reported without amendment S. J. Res. 164, to continue certain emergency powers through June 1952 (S. Rept. 1737)(pp. 7153-4).
6. LAND TRANSFER. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 3052, to authorize certain land and other property transactions, including transfer to the Navy of a tract at Oceanside, San Diego, Calif., which was part of the land used by USDA for an emergency rubber project. (S. Rept. 1731)(p. 7153).
7. TERRITORY. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment S. J. Res. 149, to provide for continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (S. Rept. 1739)(p. 7153).
8. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Watkins inserted the report to the President from the International Development Advisory Board, which was asked to study the Point 4 program (pp. 7197-8).
9. GRAIN-STORAGE INVESTIGATION. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to reopen the hearings on CCC grain storage, beginning June 18 (p. 7570).
10. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Ken inserted his letter to Secretary Brannan asking the Secretary to either prove that the Senator has voted against farm legislation or else withdraw the charge that he has done so (p. 7155).

HOUSE

11. EMERGENCY POWERS. Passed, 284-69, without amendment H. J. Res. 477, to continue certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed Dec. 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953. This measure continues 48 of the 60 statutory provisions requested by the President. (pp. 7132-44.)
12. DEFENSE PRODUCTION; PARITY PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the Banking and Currency Committee voted to extend the Defense Production Act for 1 year, until June 30, 1953, approving extension of wage, rent, and price controls, but eliminating credit controls (regulations W and X). It also adopted the Eains amendment providing for price support at 90% of parity for basic commodities while title IV of DPA is in effect. (p. 7573.)
13. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 2610, providing that excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to certain lands that will receive a supplemental or regulated water supply from the San Luis Valley project, Colo. (H. Rept. 2145) (p. 7150).
14. TRANSPORTATION. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee reported with amendment H. R. 5803, to prevent the shipment in interstate commerce of illegal undersized fish (H. Rept. 2148) (p. 7150).
15. IRRIGATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported with amendment H. R. 6723, approving contracts with the Gering and Fort Laramie, the Goshen, and the Pathfinder irrigation districts; and to authorize execution of contracts with individual water right contractors on the North Platte Federal reclamation project and with the Northport irrigation district (H. Rept. 2150) (p. 7150).
Concurred in the Senate amendment on H. R. 5633, to approve a contract with the Owyhee Federal project irrigation districts (pp. 7128-9). This bill will now be sent to the President.



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 82^d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 98

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 11, 1952

No. 101

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we are daily approaching Thy throne of majesty and mercy, compelled by our many needs, constrained by Thy love, and encouraged by every gracious invitation in Thy holy word.

Grant that our aspirations and actions, our plans and purposes, our deliberations and decisions may all witness to our sincere longing to provide and share with mankind a larger measure of health and happiness, of peace and prosperity, of safety and security, and the blessings which we so richly enjoy.

May the members of the human family be more closely united in the bonds of friendship and good will and mutual service as they seek to build a nobler civilization.

To Thy name we give all the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 97. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Cheatham Dam on the Cumberland River in Tennessee.

FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 221) which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement

the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following corrections:

In the first sentence of section 5 of the bill strike out "\$4,000,000," and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000,000," and strike out the word "completing."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6336, an act to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 13, strike out "such sums of money as may be necessary" and insert "not to exceed \$19,700,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand this does not materially change the bill?

Mr. DURHAM. It does not change it in any way at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAW-ABIDING PEOPLE IN DISTRESS

(Mr. MAGEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago I received the following communication from a constituent of mine:

CHILlicothe, Mo., June 4, 1952.

Subject: Good law-abiding people in distress. Senator McGEE,

Washington, D. C.:

I am in receipt of your valued letter of sympathy after my husband's death, February 25 this year.

At present I am confined to a bed in a nursing home here at 406 Walnut. This is being written with my knowledge and consent by my nephew, Ruel Glover, who is being held in the county jail here, charged with untrue charges, and because we cannot raise necessary bail money he has to stay in jail until September circuit court because he is not and will not plead guilty to any of the four charges. He is needed by me for assistance and help because I am almost helpless.

He does not have a lawyer and very little money. Please help us in some way, and if I live until November I will make Chula and Farmersville Republican again.

Yours truly,

Mrs. L. L. WORTMAN.

By RUEL GLOVER.

I would like to ask my friends, if I have any, and especially my Republican friends on the left: How in the hell is a New Deal Democrat going to answer that kind of letter?

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on roll call 98 I am listed as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the permanent Record and Journal will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes on Monday, June 16, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM IN LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

(Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. POULSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor is now considering a mine safety bill. I ask unanimous consent that the committee may have permission to sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 100]

Aandahl	Engle	Morton
Abernethy	Fenton	Nelson
Adair	Fine	O'Neill
Albert	Frazier	O'Toole
Allen, Ill.	Fulton	Potter
Anfuso	Gamble	Powell
Bates, Ky.	Gavin	Proby
Beckworth	Gore	Rabaut
Belcher	Hall, Edwin	Reece, Tenn.
Blackney	Arthur	Reed, Ill.
Blatnik	Halleck	Richards
Brehm	Harden	Riehlman
Brooks	Harvey	Rooney
Brown, Ohio	Havener	Sabath
Buckley	Hedrick	Sasser
Burdick	Heffernan	Shelley
Butler	Herter	Short
Carlyle	Johnson	Simpson, Pa.
Carnahan	Jonas	Springer
Chapinfield	Kennedy	Stanley
Cole, Kans.	Kerr	Stigler
Coudert	Klein	Stockman
Crawford	Lesinski	Sutton
Dawson	Marrow	Tackett
Denny	Miller, Calif.	Teague
Dolliver	Moran	Welch
Donovan	Morgan	Williams, Miss.
Ellsworth	Morris	Wood, Ga.
Elston	Morrison	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and forty-seven Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7345) to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DOUGHTON, COOPER, DINGELL, MILLS, REED of New York, WOODRUFF, and JENKINS.

OWYHEE IRRIGATION PROJECT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5633) to approve a contract negotiated with the irrigation districts on the Owyhee Federal project, to authorize its execution, and for other purposes, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the contracts referred to in sections 2 to 5 of this act, which have been negotiated by the Secretary of the Interior, pursuant to section 7 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), are hereby approved, and the Secretary is authorized to execute them on behalf of the United States.

"OWYHEE PROJECT, IDAHO-OREGON

"SEC. 2. The amendatory repayment contract dated August 29, 1951, with the Gem irrigation district, the Ridgeview irrigation district, the Owyhee irrigation district, the Ontario-Nyssa irrigation district, the Advancement irrigation district, the Payette-Oregon Slope irrigation district, the Crystal irrigation district, the Bench irrigation district, and the Slide irrigation district.

"RIVERTON PROJECT, WYOMING

"SEC. 3. The contract with the Midvale irrigation district, which contract was approved by the electors of the district on May 14, 1952.

"MILK RIVER PROJECT, MONTANA

"SEC. 4. The contract with the Malta irrigation district which was executed by said district pursuant to the laws of the State of Montana and in conformity with the order of the District Court of the Seventeenth Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the county of Phillips, dated March 6, 1951, in the confirmation proceedings on said contract before said court; and the contract with the Glasgow irrigation district which was executed by said district pursuant to the laws of the State of Montana and in conformity with the order of the District Court of the Seventeenth Judicial District of the State of Montana, in and for the county of Valley, dated October 1, 1951, in the confirmation proceedings on said contract before said court.

"(a) The 1947 reclassification of the lands of the Malta irrigation district and the Glasgow irrigation district of the Milk River project, Montana, made in accordance with

the provisions of section 8 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and approved by the board of commissioners of the Malta irrigation district by resolution, dated June 24, 1948, and by the board of commissioners of the Glasgow irrigation district by resolution, dated July 1, 1948, is approved.

"(b) Contingent upon the execution of the contract with the Malta irrigation district, approved in this section, there shall be deducted from the total costs of the project, as the Malta irrigation district's share thereof, the sum of \$663,644 on account of 12,128 acres, within the Malta irrigation district, found to be permanently unproductive by the 1947 reclassification of lands.

"(c) Contingent upon the execution of the contract with the Glasgow irrigation district, approved in this section, there shall be deducted from the total costs of the project, as the Glasgow irrigation district's share thereof, the sum of \$5,691 on account of 104 acres within the Glasgow irrigation district, found to be permanently unproductive by the 1947 reclassification of lands.

"(d) There shall be deducted from the total costs of the project on account of non-district lands found to be permanently unproductive by the 1947 reclassification of lands, which reclassification as to nondistrict lands is hereby approved, the sum of \$7,661 on account of 140 acres formerly excluded from the Glasgow irrigation district and not intended to be included within said district.

"(e) The Secretary is authorized, in his discretion, to cancel and deduct from the total costs of the Glasgow division of the Milk River project, Montana, the construction charge obligation against any of the lands within said division of said project which are not actually included within the Glasgow irrigation district. The amount of said cancellation and deduction shall be computed by the Secretary by multiplying the total number of acres of land formerly intended to be included within the irrigation district but not so included by the sum of \$54.72 per acre.

"(f) The Secretary, at any time subsequent to the execution of the contracts approved in this section, and not later than January 1, 1960, shall reclassify and designate as either class 1, 2, 3, 4a, 4b, or 6, as provided in said contracts, all lands within the Malta and Glasgow irrigation districts designated as class 5 by the 1947 reclassification of lands, and the reclassification and designation as class 6 of any of said lands shall reduce the construction charge obligation of the district in which such class 6 lands are situated by the sum of \$54.72 per acre.

"(g) The amounts deducted from the construction charge obligation of either or both the Malta and Glasgow irrigation districts, and from the total costs of the Milk River project, as provided for herein and adjusted in the contracts approved in this section, shall be charged off as a permanent loss to the reclamation fund, but no adjustment shall be made by the United States by reason thereof with any individual landowner by way of refund of or credit on account of sums heretofore paid, repaid, returned, or due and payable to the United States, by way of exchange of land, or by any other method.

"FRENCHTOWN PROJECT, MONTANA

"SEC. 5. The contract dated September 6, 1951, with the Frenchtown irrigation district.

"SEC. 6. All costs and expenses incurred by the United States in negotiating and completing the contracts approved under sections 3 and 4 of this act and in making the investigations in connection therewith and in future determinations under said contracts with respect to the productivity of temporarily unproductive lands shall, contin-

gent upon the final confirmation and execution of the contracts, be nonreimbursable and nonreturnable under the Federal reclamation laws. The water rights formerly appurtenant to the permanently unproductive lands referred to in the contracts aforesaid shall be disposed of by the United States under the reclamation laws with a preference right to the water users on the respective reclamation projects.

"Sec. 7. This act is declared to be a part of the Federal reclamation laws as those laws are defined in the Reclamation Project Act of 1939."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the amendment?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, this is a Senate amendment combining four closely related House bills. Let me say first that I have cleared this request with the leadership on both sides and also with three members of the Interior Committee whose bills were combined.

This bill, now an act from the Senate, combines four House bills approving repayment contracts on certain projects. The amendment is acceptable to the authors of the bills on the House side.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How about the general public? What does it do to them?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think the amendment is quite satisfactory and the measure is in the public interest.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman says the amendment is acceptable to the authors of the House bills. Has each of these bills been considered and approved by the gentleman's committee?

Mr. MURDOCK. Three of these bills have been approved by the committee. Four bills are included. I will ask the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'Ewart] to answer the question and also that of the minority leader, if he will.

Mr. D'Ewart. Three of the bills were enacted by the House and sent over to the Senate. The Senate included one in Wyoming that had not been enacted by the House and which our committee refused. I think the one in Wyoming is a minor readjustment of repayment of a contract there. They have to do with adjustment of repayment contracts. They have nothing to do with new projects or new authorizations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 331 OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. MURDOCK submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 1739) to amend section 331 of the Public Health Service Act, as

amended, concerning the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 1739)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1739) to amend section 331 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, concerning the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by the Senate insert the following:

"When so provided in appropriations available for any fiscal year for the maintenance of hospitals of the Service, the Surgeon General is authorized and directed to make payments to the Board of Health of the Territory of Hawaii for the care and treatment in its facilities of persons afflicted with leprosy at a per diem rate, determined from time to time by the Surgeon General, which shall, subject to the availability of appropriations, be approximately equal to the per diem operating cost per patient of such facilities, except that such per diem rates shall not be greater than the comparable per diem operating cost per patient at the National Leprosarium, Carville, Louisiana."

And the Senate agree to the same.

MONROE M. REDDEN,
LLOYD M. BENTSEN, Jr.,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RUSSELL B. LONG,
GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
ZALES N. ECTON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1739) to amend section 331 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, concerning the care and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy, submit the following statement in explanation of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

As passed by the House, the bill provided that States, Territories, or possessions outside the continental limits of the United States which have facilities for the care of persons afflicted with Hansen's disease (leprosy) and which conform to reasonable standards for patient care may make application to the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service and he shall arrange to make payments to the health authority of the State, Territory, or possession, as the case may be, for treatment of those patients "subject to the availability of appropriations."

The Senate struck out all of the House bill after the colon on page 1, line 8, and inserted an amendment in the nature of a substitute. The Senate amendment confined treatment under this bill to persons in Hawaii afflicted with leprosy and provides that payment for the same shall be made "out of funds available for the maintenance of hospitals of the Public Health Service."

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment which is a substitute for both the House bill and the Senate amendment. The substitute amendment agreed upon by the conferees is similar to the Senate amendment, confining treatment under this bill to lepers in Hawaii except such treatment shall be available "when so provided in appropri-

ations for any fiscal year for the maintenance of hospitals of the Service."

Thus, under the conference substitute, treatment would be available in Hawaii only when provided for that purpose in appropriations to the United States Public Health Service.

MONROE M. REDDEN,
LLOYD M. BENTSEN, Jr.,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,

Managers on the Part of the House.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

ROLL CALLS ON MONDAY NEXT TO GO OVER UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact there is a primary in the State of Maine on Monday next, I ask unanimous consent that if roll calls should develop in the House consideration of legislation on Monday that they may go over to Tuesday, with the further understanding, Mr. Speaker, that if a roll call should be demanded on the bill H. R. 7800, which is scheduled to be brought up under suspension of the rules, the roll call on Tuesday would be under the same conditions as if it occurred on Monday, requiring a two-thirds vote of the House membership to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Or any other suspension?

Mr. PRIEST. Or any other suspension that might be considered under the same conditions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1952

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 10, 1952.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the House conferees receded in connection with that portion of section 1 of the bill which

would have permitted the transfer up to 25 percent of the primary and secondary funds in either direction. In the same section the Senate agreed to the House version of the bill which permits the States 2 years beyond each fiscal year in which to complete their matching program.

With respect to section 2, the House conferees receded and agreed to an annual authorization of \$25,000,000 for projects on the Interstate Highway System. This sum is half the amount authorized by the Senate amendment.

As to section 3, the House conferees agreed to the Senate language and the authorization of \$22,500,000 for forest highways in lieu of \$22,000,000 voted in the House and \$25,000,000 voted in the Senate.

In the same section the House conferees agreed to the Senate authorization of \$22,500,000 for forest development roads and trails in lieu of \$19,250,000 provided in the House bill. This agreement was reached with the understanding that not less than \$5,000,000 of this amount will be applied in each of two fiscal years—or a total of \$10,000,000—to timber access roads as outlined in the Senate committee report on S. 2437.

In connection with section 4, there was no disagreement as to amounts and the Senate conferees agreed to the House proviso with respect to the Baltimore-Washington Parkway.

With respect to section 5, relating to the Rama Road, the Senate amendment did not contain provision for this authorization and the Senate agreed to its inclusion at the House figure of \$2,000,000 for each fiscal year, June 30, 1953 and 1954.

As to section 6, relating to the Inter-American Highway, the Senate amendment provided \$56,000,000 to complete this project. The Senate conferees agreed to the House version providing \$8,000,000 for each fiscal year, June 30, 1953 and 1954, thus reducing the Senate amendment authorization by \$40,000,000.

In section 7, concerning the emergency fund, the Senate authorization was \$15,000,000. The 1950 act carried a similar provision. The Senate language is, in effect, a reauthorization of the previous emergency fund to establish it upon an annual replenishment basis. The House conferees agreed to its inclusion but reduced the annual limit of expenditure from \$15,000,000 to \$10,000,000. There is a balance of \$8,000,000 in the emergency fund under the 1950 act so the new language, in effect, results in an increase of only \$2,000,000.

Section 8 of the conference agreement relates to public lands roads and is the same as section 10 of the 1950 act but with the authorization reduced from \$5,000,000 to \$2,500,000. The House bill had no such authorization but the House conferees agreed to the Senate amendment.

Section 9 of the House bill authorized \$200,000 annually for the President's Highway Safety Conference. The Senate authorized \$100,000 for this purpose, and the conferees agreed to a compromise figure of \$150,000.

Section 10 deals with defense access roads. The House authorized \$12,000,000 for access roads to timber and mineral resources. The Senate authorized \$50,000,000 to be applied generally to all types of defense access roads.

The House conferees took into consideration that there would have to be special legislation for this item, as we did last October when we raised the amount from \$10,000,000 to \$45,000,000. We had no hearings on this in the House, but the Senate, which had their hearings at a later date, had the Defense Department officials appear before them. It was necessary for it to be included in the Federal highway bill because time was of the essence and they were afraid it would be impossible, in view of the lateness of the session, to get a special bill carrying this amount of \$50,000,000.

In agreeing to the Senate amendment the House conferees felt that the subject of access roads to timber and mineral resources, as provided in the House bill, was adequately covered by this section and in the language with respect to forest development roads and trails in the Senate report on S. 2437.

Of course, all of you know the importance of the Federal highway system today. We are a Nation on wheels, and the number of automobiles continues to increase each day. When this bill was before the House just about a week ago, the matter of the increase in traffic in the United States was brought out. It was shown that we have increased the number of vehicles by 12,000,000 in the past 10 years. With the seriousness of the road conditions today, it is absolutely necessary that we have all the funds possible to put our roads in a condition where they are not only safe but where we can move commerce.

It is estimated that in the next 2 years, and I think the estimate might be low, that the Federal Government will collect from the automobile and truck users \$4,000,000,000 in taxes.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the conferees, who unanimously agreed to this conference report, I wholeheartedly urge this body to adopt this report.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman has been appealing to the Congress to meet this deplorable situation that is developing in our traffic throughout the Nation. Does the gentleman feel we ought also to give some consideration to the very alarming situation that has arisen in regard to the school systems of the country?

Mr. FALLON. That does not come within the jurisdiction of our committee. I am in favor, however, of these roads which aid school busses to get to and from their destinations safely and help to protect the children.

Mr. BAILEY. I just wanted the gentleman's opinion on that.

Mr. FALLON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. What disposition was made of the Rama Road authorization? Was that reduced from \$8,000,000 to \$4,000,000 or was it extended over a period of 4 years at \$2,000,000 a year?

Mr. FALLON. The authorization for the Rama Road was reduced to \$2,000,000 for each fiscal year June 30, 1953 and 1954 by action of the House when we brought in the bill. The Senate receded and agreed to the House language.

Mr. BAILEY. That is the status of the authorization right now?

Mr. FALLON. That is right.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SECREST. May I point out that this is important in rural areas throughout the whole United States to the operation of the school buses, for they go over the roads that will be improved under this farm-to-market road program and the access road program.

Mr. FALLON. That is very true. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] has covered the ground completely and adequately. There is very little that can be said in addition to what he has already said. It might be pointed out or at least emphasized that while this bill grants to the roads of this country some \$690,000,000 a year for 2 years, nevertheless in the same period of time we are collecting from the people for the same purpose, \$2,000,000,000 a year. Or in other words all that we are giving back from the gas tax and the oil tax to put on the roads of this country, which the motorists use, is about one-third of the money that they pay in. I think that the increase that was placed in the bill in the other body is of a moderate nature. We agreed to it. As I say, I think it is a good bill, and it is a necessary bill. It has a bearing on our national defense because so much on the Nation's traffic today travels over good roads, particularly the primary roads of the Nation. Of course, that contributes to the defense effort of the country. Coming from a section of the country, as I do, where we make a majority of the automobiles which are manufactured in the United States, you can well understand my interest in roads. As I said at the time the bill was on the floor, if we want to go back to the philosophy of an English statesman 300 years ago, we know and realize that good roads are one of the three things which make a nation great and strong. That is what we are dealing with in this conference report. I hope the report will be adopted without a dissenting vote. There is no bill more important to the Nation's welfare than this bill to keep up the highway system of this country, especially in view of the fact that we are told that we are wearing out the roads faster than we are building them today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The conference report does not in any way reduce the amount as fixed by the House for farm to market roads in urban areas; does it?

Mr. DONDERO. It does not.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. I want to ask a question relative to the moneys to be allotted to each State in the event that the State should have snowstorms, or some other sort of emergency condition, to the extent that the State would not be able to match the Federal funds. Would they lose their funds under this bill?

Mr. DONDERO. I think that is held over so that they would not lose it immediately, however, I think they would have to act within a reasonable time, although I cannot tell the gentleman just what the length of time is.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. We have set up in the bill \$10,000,000 for an emergency fund, and in addition they have 2 years in which they can avail themselves of the matching opportunities.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. If they do not take advantage of it in 2 years, then they can avail themselves of the \$10,000,000 in the emergency fund?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. It is true, is it not that the conference report recognizes that there is almost complete agreement between the Senate conferees and the House conferees with reference to the three main categories of roads provided for in the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct, and that is not changed.

Mr. ANGELL. That is not changed, and the allotments are not changed, nor is the rule changed.

Mr. DONDERO. Nor the amount of money so far as the three original categories for roads is concerned.

Mr. ANGELL. It is also true, is it not, that a considerable portion of the increase suggested by the other body is due to the national defense effort?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct. The \$50,000,000 which they added, and which was not in the House bill, when it left this Chamber, is due to that.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Is this statement not correct? That this legislation does not satisfy all groups, nor does it satisfy all the conferees. But, it is a matter of negotiation, and shall we say of agreement, and it is a give and take program so that we can get something back to the Congress and pass it prior to June 30, which is the date covered by the appropriation bill?

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. MCGREGOR. It is really a compromise, and the conference report was

signed by all members of the conference committee of the House and Senate.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct, a few of the items were the subject of compromise.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN.]

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is 95 percent good.

When the President of the United States in January came before the Congress with his budget message, he requested that the Congress authorize only \$400,000,000 for the construction of roads during each of the next 2 years. That would be 20 percent less than the amount authorized during each of the seven preceding years.

This conference report allows \$550,000,000 per year. This does not necessarily mean that we are going to build more roads in the United States than we have been building, because highway construction costs, according to the Bureau of Roads have increased 150 percent since 1946. In other words, \$550,000,000 during each of the next 2 years will not build any more roads than \$400,000,000 would have built in the years 1945 and 1946.

On the whole, this is a good bill. I am disappointed, however, that the House conferees did not see fit to delete the appropriation for the construction of the Rama Road in Nicaragua. We are already engaged in the building of a \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 stretch of road in Nicaragua from the northern boundary to the southern boundary of that country and this road is a link in the Inter-American Highway. The Senate in its wisdom rejected the whole proposition that we should appropriate money for the Rama Road, and I think very properly so.

The Rama Road absurdity arose out of three letters. On May 22, 1939, President Somoza, of Nicaragua, sent a letter to Franklin Roosevelt, the President of the United States, in which he said that he wondered if the United States would assist Nicaragua in the building of a small, shallow-draft canal from the ocean into the interior of Nicaragua. President Somoza asked specifically that the United States Army Engineers be directed to survey the route of this canal to see whether the project were feasible.

The second letter was President Roosevelt's letter saying that he would make the survey for the proposed Nicaragua canal and without cost to Nicaragua.

Then there came into existence the third letter. The engineers reported that the canal was not feasible. Then the State Department wrote a letter to President Somoza, of Nicaragua, saying

that inasmuch as the United States was not going to build this canal, a very small shallow-draft canal for barges and small boats into the interior of Nicaragua, that the United States would give Nicaragua a road. President Somoza had asked for a survey. He received a survey, and then the State Department by letter authorized the building of a road into the interior of Nicaragua.

My position is that I think it is a mistake for the Congress to permit the Secretary of State or any other executive official of the Government to authorize projects by the mere process of letter-writing. I feel that the Congress should disapprove of that sort of procedure. I regret the Rama Road has been left in the bill by the conferees.

(Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. SCUDDER].

(Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 7340, the Federal aid to highways bill, which was under consideration for several months by the Public Works Committee.

The bill as first introduced called for an authorization of \$400,000,000 a year for the next 2 years, which was \$100,000,000 less per year than had been authorized 2 years previously. Extensive hearings were held, and it was developed beyond a shadow of doubt that the highways of our country were in need of much greater assistance than had been previously given. The information the committee had, was that the Federal Government would collect during the coming fiscal year about \$800,000,000 from Federal gas tax. It was felt that the very least that we could do in support of our highways was to provide as much money as had been granted 2 years ago, and, in order to make up for some of the increased cost, to add 10 percent; therefore, this bill carries an authorization for \$550,000,000 per year for the ensuing 2 years.

We also provided that this money should be allocated in accordance with the formula which had been in effect for many years. Realizing the necessity for forest highways and roads and trails, these amounts were increased accordingly. Special provision has been made to increase the funds for access roads to military installations and also has been provided for the construction and improvement of roads and trails in our national forests and parks.

There has also been earmarked moneys for the access roads, to develop timber and mineral resources, which I am sure, will be highly beneficial in the harvesting of timber, particularly where overripe and inaccessible stands are located, besides the developing of many of our mineral resources.

The versions of the two bodies have been well coordinated in the development of this report, and I fully support the conference report.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY POWERS CONTINUATION ACT

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 677 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 477) to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions for the duration of the national emergency proclaimed December 16, 1950, and 6 months thereafter, but not beyond June 30, 1953. That after general debate which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order consideration of House Joint Resolution 477 reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. The purpose of the House joint resolution is to extend some 48 powers which are now exercised by the President of the United States, called emergency war powers.

The report filed by the committee, in my judgment, is the best done of any report that has come to my hands from any committee of the House. I want to commend the committee for the excellent manner in which it has presented this subject matter.

Starting on page 6 of the report there are set out all of the provisions which it is sought to extend. They are discussed in a very brief but excellent manner and reasons are given why they should be extended.

There are one or two of these powers which the bill seeks to extend upon which I am sure there must be some controversy. Particularly I call attention to that provision which seeks to extend the liability of inductees to serve in the reserve components and to be ordered to active duty in time of war. I am sure there will be some controversy about that.

The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate on the bill, after which the bill will be read for amendment.

There is one quite interesting provision in this bill to which I would like

to call attention, and it may be that it will set a pattern for the consideration of other items that will soon be before this body. I read from the report:

Another problem which was of considerable concern is item 1 (a) (27) which empowers the President in time of war to seize the transportation systems of the country. It was under this authority that the President took possession of certain railroad lines in 1950, control of which he released only a few days ago. When Congress enacted the basic law back in 1916, empowering the President to seize the transportation industry, it intended that he should exercise this tremendous grant of power in time of war only. It is the considered opinion of the committee that Congress should be cautious and slow in extending this tremendous grant of power in the Executive to a period where there is no state of actual declared war. Therefore, it has omitted this item 1 (a) (27) from the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that we have no representative of the Rules Committee on our side, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 101]

Aandahl	Flood	Morris
Abernethy	Frazier	Morrison
Adair	Fulton	Morton
Albert	Gamble	Nelson
Allen, Ill.	Gore	O'Neill
Anfuso	Hall	Osmers
Bates, Ky.	Edwin Arthur	O'Toole
Beckworth	Hall	Potter
Belcher	Leonard W.	Powell
Bender	Halleck	Rabaut
Blackney	Harden	Reece, Tenn.
Brehm	Harvey	Reed, Ill.
Brooks	Hébert	Richards
Brown, Ohio	Hedrick	Richman
Buckley	Heffernan	Rooney
Burdick	Herter	Ross
Butler	Jarman	Sabath
Carlyle	Johnson	Short
Carahan	Kennedy	Spence
Coudert	Kerr	Stanley
Crawford	Klein	Stigler
Dawson	Lesinski	Stockman
Dolliver	McMillan	Sutton
Donovan	Mansfield	Tackett
Ellsworth	Morrow	Thomas
Elston	Miller, Calif.	Vinson
Fenton	Morano	Welch
Fine	Morgan	Williams, Miss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and forty-three Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EMERGENCY POWERS CONTINUATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE] is recognized.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, as I stated a moment ago there will unquestionably be controversial matters in the bill to be considered when it is read for amend-

ment, but I am quite certain there will be no controversy about the adoption of the rule or the consideration of the bill. The rule provides for 2 hours of general debate and that amendments may be offered to any provision of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM].

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas has so ably stated, this is an extension of the emergency powers of the President. There are some sixty-odd provisions in the bill. I believe there are some differences of opinion with regard to certain of these provisions, and under this open rule amendments will be offered. I know of no objection, however, to the consideration or adoption of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

TIDELANDS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post, in an editorial printed yesterday morning, attempted to discredit the effort of the Congress to return the title to submerged lands within State boundaries by stating that the States never had title to these lands. To make its point the Post makes the utterly unfounded statement that "the resolution adopted by Congress and vetoed a fortnight ago by the President had nothing to do, in point of fact, with lands within State boundaries."

Since this statement is so typical of the deliberate misrepresentation which has characterized the entire effort to grab these lands for the benefit of a bunch of claim-jumpers, I want to analyze it. It shall confine my statements to the State of Texas. Other facts substantiate the rights of other States but I shall presume to speak only for Texas.

Before I go into the historic facts let me explain my statement that the effort to take these lands from the States was primarily for the benefit of a bunch of claim-jumpers. By "claim-jumping" I mean those private groups and individuals who have filed on lands already leased to private interests. These speculators have been locating old Government script on the already developed offshore oil fields, particularly in California. They hope to reap billions where someone else has sowed. If successful they will get seven barrels of oil for every one which goes to the Federal Government. They are in fact the oil lobby which should excite the fears of the Post and of all honest Americans, but strangely enough these are the people who are turning up with connections in the strangest places.

But back to the question of ownership within State boundaries, the Post says:

Texas enjoyed such rights and dominion during the decade of her independence but relinquished them upon relinquishing her

copper at all, thus jeopardizing thousands of small businesses and the jobs of tens of thousands of their employees.

LYNCHBURG ENGRAVING CO.,
ARTHUR MEIDLING, President.

Mr. President, I should like to conclude. Of course, there will be other Senators on this side of the aisle who will want to speak on my amendment.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I think the question presentation by the Senator from Arkansas is one of the most important that has been before the Senate this year. I realize that we have had one quorum call, but I should like to have more Senators present to hear the conclusion of the statement of the Senator from Arkansas. Would the Senator from Arkansas yield for that purpose?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Michigan; but we tried that once and the Members will not respond to a quorum call. I think it would only waste the time of the Senate. I appreciate the Senator's suggestion.

I merely want to emphasize again that I do not believe the Senate understood the full implication of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan. I engaged in that debate, and I followed it quite carefully. Our attention was focused upon the International Materials Conference, and it was thought that the principal effect of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan would be in regard to the International Materials Conference. I did not realize in the course of that debate that it would have the effect of destroying the controlled materials plan. I do not believe the Senate and the Congress really desire to destroy the controlled materials plan. I leave only this thought, that if the Senate should adopt my amendment, it would not automatically nullify the Ferguson amendment. The only effect would be that there would be in the bill two inconsistent amendments which would have to be reconciled, and an acceptable result obtained. That will have to be done. It could be done by the House, or, more likely, in conference.

I notice that Representative SADLAK has proposed in the House an amendment which is identical with the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan. If through oversight or because of the rush at the end of the session that amendment should be adopted, then there would be no possibility, unless my amendment were adopted, of doing anything with respect to the Ferguson amendment. We would be bound by it, and either the President would have to accept it with all the consequences, or he would have to veto the bill.

So I think there is but one sensible thing to do, and that is to adopt my amendment. Even though some Senators may have doubts about the opinion of the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of the Petroleum Administration for Defense, and the Secretary of the Interior—there is another letter here, I may say, which has reference to the electric power program in which he is also particularly interested—at least we should give them the benefit of the

doubt and adopt my amendment, so that the matter will be in conference, and then, after further deliberation and additional consideration by the members, the problem could be resolved and a solution reached.

If, after such a process of deliberation I should be proved to be wrong, and the matter could not otherwise be straightened out, my amendment could be eliminated, because it would be in conflict with the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. But I think we at least own that much deference to the leading and responsible members of this administration, who are trying to administer the defense production program. So I submit that even for those who think that I may not be entirely correct, they still are justified in voting for my amendment, in order that the question involved may be given further study.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Assuming the correctness of everything the Senator from Arkansas says about the allocation and the acquisition of scarce commodities, and so on, the amendment proposes that the Senate give its consent to the appointment by the President of representatives to a group, which I understand is an informal group, not authorized in any way by law, or set up under any treaty we have ratified. I say this as a member of the Appropriations Committee, because in checking up on how the money was appropriated to this activity, I find there is no way by which money can be appropriated, except by using the emergency fund. In other words, for the first time, I believe, although I do not know positively, the consent and advice of the Senate is being asked to authorize the appointment of representatives to an organization which does not exist legally.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may explain the reason for the provision referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts. It was the only way I could think of by which to give the Senate what I call a veto power on the appointment of representatives to the International Materials Conference. I may say the Senator is quite right, it is an informal group, it has no statutory authorization, and it carries no legal obligation. What happened was that in the early part of last year certain persons, such as Mr. Fleischmann, Administrator of the National Production Authority, or Mr. Charles E. Wilson and others, representing other nations concerned with mutual defense, got together informally and said, there is a terrible situation. Since Korea, there has been a mad scramble for all strategic materials, and prices have gone up out of sight on such items as cobalt, tin, copper, rubber, and so on. Let us see if we cannot agree on a plan which will bring about an equitable distribution. My amendment would give the Senate more authority than it has had, a more effective check upon these matters.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for one more question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It seems to me, even though I may agree with what the Senator has said with respect to other aspects of the subject, that to vote to put the Senate in such a position would be highly questionable, because it would appear to me to be stretching the Constitution, or stretching the law, if the question is not a constitutional one. That is emphasized by the fact that the State Department cannot ask for a direct appropriation for the body which has been referred to, because it does not legally exist.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not see why the Senator's committee has to make any appropriation. If the committee is opposed to it, I would assume that it would vote against it.

There is no compulsion upon the Senate to agree to the appointment of representatives under my amendment. The Senator well knows that the purpose of the amendment is to throw the matter into conference so that some solution can be worked out. I would be the last person to state that every word of the amendment is a final solution.

I was amazed that the Senate was so confused that it adopted the Ferguson amendment. Something had to be done about it. A motion to reconsider it was laid on the table that night. The amendment was adopted by a margin of only 3 votes. So all Senators were not confused. But, in any case, something must be done about it. I am trying to reach it in a parliamentary manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous ruling, the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina is not in order.

The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield so that the Senate may dispose of a conference report? I do not think it will take more than 5 minutes.

Mr. FREAR. I yield for that purpose.

CONTINUANCE OF CONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL-AID ROAD ACT, 1916—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing

the construction of highways, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 10, 1952, pp. 7090-7092.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the agreement reached by the Senate and House conferees on the highway bill, H. R. 7340, is a compromise under which the conferees adopted on some items a figure falling part way between the respective figures approved in the Senate and House versions of the bill. On other items, the Senate conferees were unable to persuade the House conferees to recede from their position, and the House version was accepted in order to reach agreement on the bill as a whole. On some items, the situation was reversed and the House conferees accepted the Senate version. In my opinion, the conference agreement represents a reasonable compromise and it gives us a sound bill for continuing the Federal-aid highway program for another 2-year period.

There are 12 principal authorization items in the bill. Three of these were not in conference. As to the nine items in conference we were able to hold to the Senate's position on three of them. On three others, we agreed upon a compromise figure, and on the remaining three items, we had to recede to the House figures. So the net result was about a 50-50 split between the positions of the Senate and House.

I think we now have a good bill the best bill we can get under the present circumstances. I ask for the Senate's approval of the conference report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the Rama Road included in the report?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The House version is included, but not the proposal recommended by the Senate committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator explain to the Senate what the provision is with reference to the Rama Road?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator will recall that the Senate committee recommended an outright authorization of \$8,000,000. The House provision was \$2,000,000 for two consecutive years. We compromised on the House version.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I shall want to speak on this matter for some time, and I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make an inquiry of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who is in charge of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan will suspend. A quorum call is in progress.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded and that further proceedings in connection with the order be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, my question is, will the Senator from New Mexico withdraw his report until we finish with the amendment now pending?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand that the pending amendment will be under consideration for only a short time, so I withdraw the report for the present.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the change or modification made by the Senator from Arkansas in his amendment certainly improves the amendment. I believe, however, that basically there is much in the amendment that should be discussed, and I seriously doubt that the Senate can vote intelligently upon an amendment such as the one the Senator from Arkansas has proposed after a debate of only 30 minutes to each side. Therefore, if we discuss the amendment, we had better do so in very plain language. Then it could be rejected or it could be referred to committee, or some other disposition made of it, rather than have it become law.

Mr. President, it is necessary for me to disagree to the amendment which the Senator from Arkansas has just ably discussed.

First of all, the effect of his proposal is to repeal the Ferguson amendment, which was approved by the Senate on Friday of last week. However, as I interpret the new amendment, it does much more than to allow continuation of the International Materials Conference, and I hope that the Senate will note its implications quite carefully.

In the first place, the amendment speaks of economic mobilization and what may be done to insure its accomplishment under the provisions of this proposal. Why does the amendment speak initially of economic mobilization but not mention military mobilization? Does the amendment intend to give the President sufficient authority to direct economic mobilization, whether for defense or nondefense purposes, in any nation of the world?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FREAR. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to finish my statement.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield in order to permit me to suggest a correction in his statement?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator seriously mean to say that my amendment would repeal the Ferguson amendment? That is not quite correct, is it?

Mr. FREAR. In substance, that is about what it would do.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is simply inconsistent with it. I think some adjustment would have to be worked out.

Mr. FREAR. There may be some provisions that are alike, but there are still many differences.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree that there are differences, but my amendment would not repeal the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. FREAR. I still submit to the Senator from Arkansas that that would be the effect of his amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is the intended effect, but, unfortunately, I cannot repeal the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. FREAR. I am sorry if the Senator thinks it is unfortunate.

Mr. President, does the United States intend to assume responsibility for the economic destiny of every other country on the face of the earth? As I understand the amendment, it would allow representatives of this country, together with those of other nations, to discuss the utilization of any type of material which they desire. This certainly takes in all agricultural and mineral products, and may also include manufactured goods. We have been speaking of copper, but cotton and wool are already under the IMC.

I am also deeply concerned because the provisions of the amendment allow committees of international representatives to discuss the effective distribution of any materials. In other words, those representatives would have the authority to say what is best for the whole world. I ask the Senate whether we are ready to abandon free competitive world markets, which historically have set the prices and determined the distribution of available materials. I remind the Senate that on Monday of this week we reaffirmed our faith in free competitive enterprise when we approved the MSA bill, which specifically urged European countries to abandon cartel practices which they have followed for many years. By any stretch of the imagination does the Senate believe that such a group of men, no matter how competent, how endowed, how distinguished, how industrious, can plan the lives of more than 2,000,000,000 people? Mr. President, this amendment is in essence a declaration of belief in world planning or world socialism. It also should be noted that representatives from this country on the committees are designated by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Might I ask who designates and confirms the representatives of other nations, and in what numbers are they to be appointed to the committee of world economic experts? The International Materials Conference today is made up of 28 members. In this group, the United States has one vote—one vote, Mr. President, for the nation of the world which

CHART No. 1

Example of how program operates as prices advance

ASSUMED RISE PERIOD CEILINGS

Farm price.....	28¢+1¢=29¢	29¢+3¢=32¢	32¢+5¢=37¢	37¢+10¢=47¢	47¢+1¢=48¢
Processors' margin.....	6	6	6	6	6
Processors' ceiling.....	34	35	38	43	53
Wholesalers' margin.....	2	2	2	2	2
Wholesalers' ceiling.....	36	37	40	45	55
Retailers' margin.....	11	11	11	11	11
Retailers' ceiling.....	47	48	51	56	67

CHART No. 2

Example of how program can operate as prices decline

[Margin freeze nonoperative on decline]

Farm price.....	48¢-1¢=47¢	47¢-10¢=37¢	37¢-5¢=32¢	32¢-3¢=29¢	29¢-1¢=28¢
Processors' margin.....	6	6½	9	11	12
Processors' ceiling.....	54	53½	46	43	41
Wholesalers' margin.....	2	2½	3	4	5
Wholesalers' ceiling.....	56	55½	49	47	46
Retailers' margin.....	11	11½	17½	19½	20½
Retailers' ceiling.....	67	66½	66½	66½	66½

UNITED STATES SENATE,

Washington, D. C., March 6, 1951.

Mr. MICHAEL V. DiSALLE,
Director, Office of Price Stabilization,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR Mr. DiSALLE: This refers to the series of conversations which I had with Mr. J. Howard Houk and Mr. Allan Rubin of your office last week relative to the interpretation which has been placed upon section 11 (e) of the price regulation order of January 26, 1951, with particular reference to the ceiling on poultry. I was very much concerned to find that an interpretation had been placed upon this regulation to the effect that, while margins of profit would be sealed as farm prices were in a continuous advance, such margins of profit for the processor, the wholesaler and the retailer of poultry products would not be frozen in a declining market; that is, as it was pointed out to me, as farm prices advanced each 1 cent or fraction thereof, all prices could be advanced automatically up the line with the increased cost being passed on to the consumer; however, once new ceiling prices had been established at some projected level, I found that a decline of even any insignificant fraction would unlock all margin freezes, thereby making it possible for poultry prices at the farm level to decline substantially while at the same time retail prices to the wholesaler and the consumer could be maintained at near ceiling level.

The excuse offered was that it was hard to arrive at a fair or normal margin of profit to an industry and that permanent ceilings on margins during a price freeze would not be administratively feasible. I cannot follow that line of reasoning since, surely, if profit margins can be established and enforced as prices advance, why can they not be in operation in reverse?

The present interpretation is affording a golden opportunity to wartime profiteers to extend their margin far beyond that which is normal to the industry and at the same time cloak their profiteering as legal under the Defense Production Act.

That this opportunity is not being overlooked is evidenced by the market conditions of live poultry on the farms in Delaware and on the Delmarva Peninsula generally as shown by the retail price for the same grade of poultry in the New York market, the daily prices of which are reported and filed by the Marketing and Facilities Research Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture. I am seriously concerned with this interpretation and the effect which it will

have not only upon the cost of living but also upon the poultry growers on the Delmarva Peninsula. Other Senators who are also seriously concerned have joined me in introducing Senate Resolution No. 93 to correct this interpretation. A copy of this resolution is enclosed herewith.

I express the sincere hope that it will not be necessary for the Senate to be compelled to amend the legislation when the intent of Congress in this matter is clear and that you will accordingly correct this interpretation immediately, thus removing the necessity for action by the Senate. However, in the event such correction is not made, I shall feel compelled in the interest of the consumers and the farmers on the Delmarva Peninsula to insist upon action by the Senate.

An extra cent spread in the margin of handling poultry that moves from the Delmarva Peninsula in 1 week means about \$80,000 to the Delmarva farmers. A 3 to 4 cent extra spread in the margins between the New York wholesale market and the farm price as it now exists means a loss to our farmers and an extra profit to the middleman of about a quarter of a million dollars each week.

If this same interpretation prevails in relation to all other agricultural commodities, I can visualize where the farmers and the consumers could be robbed of millions.

I think in the light of these figures you will agree with me that we must have immediate action.

Will you please advise me promptly your reaction to this request and what steps you intend to take in the matter.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Quartermaster procurement of poultry for
Armed Forces

[In million pounds]

	Excluding turkeys	Average per pound (excluding turkeys)
1949—December.....	2.9	39.80
1950—January.....	2.2	36.75
February.....	1.4	42.42
March.....	2.1	48.85
April.....	2.0	49.32
May.....	2.7	46.88
June.....	4.3	48.79
July.....	4.3	53.55
August.....	10.3	54.73
September.....	13.5	51.40
October.....	9.9	51.30
November.....	7.0	51.72
December.....	4.3	50.50

Quartermaster procurement of poultry for
Armed Forces—Continued

[In million pounds]

	Excluding turkeys	Average per pound (excluding turkeys)
1951—January.....	5.3	52.58
February.....	4.4	54.30
March.....	3.4	54.86
April.....	3.6	57.55
May.....	5.0	55.53
June.....	8.1	58.52
July.....	8.6	59.32
August.....	8.5	58.03
September.....	14.5	58.25
October.....	12.9	56.58
November.....	8.5	56.37
December.....	6.3	56.32
1952—January.....	7.7	55.20
February.....	5.9	54.54
March.....	7.9	52.61
April.....	6.6	52.67

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina wish to be heard?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not wish to say anything.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for himself and other Senators. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have; the ayes have it, and the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has announced the result of the vote. It is too late to request a division.

EXCLUSION FROM GROSS INCOME THE PROCEEDS OF CERTAIN SPORTS PROGRAMS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7345) to exclude from gross income the proceeds of certain sports programs conducted for the benefit of the American National Red Cross, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. BYRD, Mr. MILLIKIN, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1952—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing

the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

Does the Senator from New Mexico wish to be heard in connection with the conference report?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I made my statement previously.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the conference report. I understand that it will be necessary to vote the conference report either up or down, and that it will be necessary to vote it down if we are to have another conference. If the conference report were voted down, as I understand, another conference would have to be held to decide the question.

In connection with the conference report, I wish to call attention to the vote of 45 yeas and 25 nays in the Senate on what is known as the Rama Road.

The Senate bill provides \$8,000,000 to complete what is known as the Rama Road, which is no part of the Inter-American highway at all, but is being constructed from Bluefield to Managua in Nicaragua.

In 1943 or 1944 the President of the United States gave to the Nicaraguan Government the sum of \$4,000,000. The report clearly indicates that at the time the President of the United States gave the money to the Nicaraguan Government it came out of what was known as the secret fund of the President of the United States, and it was not known by the Congress or by the people of the United States of America for what purpose the funds were given. He gave the sum of \$4,000,000 to the Nicaraguan Government in order to complete the road. The report stated that the best estimate was that \$2,000,000, or a little more than \$2,000,000 would be required to complete the Rama Road.

When the Senator from Michigan was on the War Investigating Committee he was assigned the duty of looking into the Inter-American highway. We discovered with respect to the Inter-American highway that the engineers had built a road, but that the Highway Commissioner of the United States was not satisfied with a part of the road that was built, consisting of some 30 or 40 miles in Guatemala. He abandoned it and built another highway. That is the way the funds of the American taxpayers were treated.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Was that road built in Nicaragua?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. KERR. Was any part of it connected with the Rama Road?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. In 1943 or 1944 the taxpayers' money was used to build a road running off the Inter-American Highway up to the farm of the President of Nicaragua. It was about 26 kilometers in length.

The road for which the \$4,000,000 was given was partly constructed. Efforts have been made to get into an appropriation bill funds to build the so-called

Rama Road. So far effort has failed. Now we discover that the funds for it are being authorized for the first time in this road bill. I call attention to the fact that the conference report provides:

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated—

Is it \$2,000,000?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Two million dollars; yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the report been changed?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. May I have a copy of the corrected report?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is at the desk. The House report contained a clerical error, and by resolution it was changed to \$2,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. The report reads: There is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year—

Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. 1953 and 1954.

Mr. FERGUSON. Ending in 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year 1954; is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. In other words, the conference report authorizes the appropriation of \$2,000,000, not for completion of the road, but merely \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1953 and an additional \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1954. Again I call the attention of the Senate to a point which I believe is vital, namely, that the estimate for completion of the road was made in 1948. As a matter of fact, if once we undertake to build the road and make the authorizations now requested, namely, for the appropriation of \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1953 and an additional \$2,000,000 for the fiscal year 1954, we shall discover that by so doing we shall not have authorized all the appropriations that will be necessary in order to complete construction of the road. On the contrary, we shall discover that additional appropriations will be required in the future.

So, Mr. President, although at this time we are requested to authorize the appropriation of \$2,000,000 for the next fiscal year, to be used for construction of this road, and \$2,000,000 for the following fiscal year, yet we must realize that the November 1948 estimate of the total cost of completing the road was \$8,000,000, and the authorizations now requested are for only half of that amount.

Furthermore, anyone who considers the degree of inflation which has occurred in recent years knows that the 1948 estimate, and it was only an estimate, of the cost of building the road is much smaller than what today's estimate would be. As a result of the inflation which has occurred, if we attempt to complete construction of this road, appropriations of much more than \$8,000,000 will be required.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me at this time?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. For the very reason the Senator from Michigan has outlined, the

Committee on Public Works recommended an authorization of appropriation in the amount of \$8,000,000, and specifically spelled out that that would be the total amount for completion of the road. If that is not done, it will be because of objections similar to those on the part of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the request to authorize the appropriation of \$8,000,000 to complete the road was rejected by the Senate; the vote in the Senate was 45 against the request to 25 in favor of it.

Now we have a proposal to authorize the appropriation of \$2,000,000 for the next fiscal year and \$2,000,000 for the following fiscal year. Thereafter we would have to appropriate large sums in addition; at that time it would be said that we would be obligated to do so because Congress had already made a commitment.

On the other hand, up to this very moment there has been no congressional commitment for construction of the highway, and Congress has no obligation whatever to Nicaragua to see that the highway is built.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me at this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Whether we have an obligation is a question of opinion. Is it not a fact that the vote to which the Senator from Michigan has referred was based upon the \$8,000,000 authorization which had been recommended by the Committee on Public Works, and not upon the authorization of \$2,000,000 which was agreed upon in the conference committee?

Mr. FERGUSON. But the Senator from New Mexico does not contend, does he, that an authorization of \$2,000,000 for the coming fiscal year would be the end of our obligation, after Congress thus recognized an obligation to complete the road?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course I do not make such a contention because I do not agree with the Senator from Michigan that there is no obligation whatsoever.

My point is that the Committee on Public Works wished to have an authorization of \$8,000,000 made, but the Senate said "No." The House voted for an authorization of \$2,000,000.

Many millions of dollars are involved in this undertaking. When a bill goes to conference, the conferees on the part of the Senate do not have to insist that everything the Senate has voted is correct. After all, a conference is for the purpose of reaching a compromise.

Instead of agreeing upon the authorization of \$8,000,000 which the committee believed should be made, the Senate conferees agreed with the House that an authorization of \$2,000,000 was a reasonable compromise; and that is all there is to the conference report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that is not quite the conference report. The conference report calls for an authorization of an appropriation of \$2,000,000 in the fiscal year 1953 and an authorization of an appropriation of \$2,000,000 in the fiscal year 1954.

Of course we know that once this conference report is agreed to and once the Congress authorizes the appropriation of \$2,000,000 in the fiscal year 1953 and \$2,000,000 in the fiscal year 1954, we shall be required to authorize and to make sufficient additional appropriations to complete the road, because the subject will be brought up again, and then we shall be told that in 1943 and 1944 the United States spent a total sum of \$4,000,000 on the road, and that for the fiscal year 1953 the Congress authorized the appropriation of an additional \$2,000,000 for the road, and that for the fiscal year 1954 the Congress authorized the appropriation of an additional \$2,000,000 for the road.

The result will be that at that time we shall have invested in this highway, which is not a part of the Inter-American Highway, \$8,000,000. Then we shall be told, "Are you the kind of country that will invest \$8,000,000—\$4,000,000 of it by act of Congress—and then will not complete the highway, with the result that that expenditure of \$8,000,000 will become useless?"

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me at this point?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will not the American people also be told that for the \$8,000,000 they will have spent on the road up to that time, they will receive a return which possibly would have cost them \$800,000,000? Will not the American people be told that, too? We got a good "deal" in this matter, I say to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we are familiar with the treaty. Back in 1914 the United States made with Nicaragua a treaty permitting the United States—not requiring us; there was no obligation whatever upon us—to build a canal across Nicaragua. The United States paid \$3,000,000 to the Nicaraguan Government for that privilege. There was absolutely no obligation upon the United States to build the canal.

On the other hand, this road does not parallel the course of any proposed canal. The road does not run all the way across Nicaragua.

I say to the Senate that when we are facing a deficit of \$14,000,000,000 for the present fiscal year; when we are asked by the Defense Department to make appropriations for a \$52,000,000,000 defense budget, from which we are told we cannot cut one dollar; when we are being asked to go into the red insofar as deficit financing is concerned; and then when we are asked to authorize the appropriation of \$2,000,000 for a road of this sort in the coming fiscal year, and an additional \$2,000,000 in the following fiscal year, and no one knows what amount of appropriations will be required for the road in the following fiscal years, at least we are entitled to inquire whether the Department of Defense had made any recommendation to the effect that this road would be useful for military purposes.

Has the Department of Defense made such a recommendation? Has the De-

partment of Defense recommended or stated that this road, when constructed, would be useful for military purposes? No, Mr. President.

Back in 1947, General Eisenhower, when he was Chief of Staff, submitted an opinion to the effect that this road, if completed, could at that time be of some military value; he certified that the road could be of hemispheric defense value.

Mr. President, we must prepare to meet what we see now as a common enemy. The common enemy today is not in Central America; today the common enemy is in Moscow.

I say to the Senate that the time has come when, so far as appropriations are concerned, we must tighten our belts, and whether an item be for \$2,000,000 or for a larger sum we must be satisfied that it is justified. After all, Mr. President, the Members of Congress are trustees for the American people of the tax revenues of the Federal Government. All the people of the United States, including the thousands and hundreds of thousands and millions of small working people, are taxed, under the income-tax laws, to provide the tax revenues of the United States Government. Each and every Member of the Senate and each and every Member of the House of Representatives is a trustee in connection with every dollar to be appropriated by the Congress from the tax revenues.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is now on the floor. He has said that he does not believe the United States Government can increase present taxes or can provide for the collection of any larger amount of tax revenue than the amount now being obtained from the American people. I share that view, and I believe the Senator from Georgia is absolutely correct when he says that the United States of America cannot afford to tax its citizens any more heavily than they are being taxed at the present time. If we increase taxes, we shall kill the incentive element in our free-enterprise system, and when our free-enterprise system dies, there will be no free enterprise anywhere in the world.

Although the authorization now requested is in the amount of only \$2,000,000, yet it involves a great principle.

No doubt, Mr. President, if I wanted to represent selfish interests, I should advocate the building of this road, for probably the result of completion of the road would be that a few more automobiles built in the city of Detroit and in the State of Michigan would be sold, for use in Nicaragua, on this road.

Mr. President, I have seen roads built in other countries, and at this time I shall mention some of them.

I recall going to Bermuda at a time when the Second World War was going on. Prior to that time, the roads in Bermuda had been dirt roads.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not yield at this moment, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as I was saying, at that time the roads in Bermuda were dirt roads.

Then we discovered that all the roads in Bermuda had been paved with black-top paving, and we discovered that the United States taxpayers had paid for the paving of those roads. However, when I went to Bermuda at about that time, I did not see on those roads any automobiles which had been manufactured in the State of Michigan. I inquired of one of the members of the Bermuda Legislature how it was that no Michigan-made or United States-made automobiles were in use on those roads. He said, "Why, that is a simple matter: We prohibited the use on the roads of any automobiles having engines of more than 10 horsepower." In other words, it was stated that the only automobiles that were to be used on the roads we built were to be made in Great Britain. I shall never forget another investigative trip we made to Trinidad.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. In a moment. I want to explain some of the things we have been doing along this line.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I merely wanted to suggest that one would not find 10-horsepower automobiles, but would on the contrary, find Michigan automobiles on the Rama Road and throughout Central America.

Mr. FERGUSON. That may or may not be the case. The people in Central America have the same power in regard to what they will import that we do. Let me tell the Senator about Trinidad. We discovered that in Trinidad the Navy had taken over a private club. It was on a plantation facing the ocean. It would accommodate about 20 persons. The Navy took it over, and they then discovered that at once the natives remarked, "America has come here, and they have taken over the club and the only bathing beach available to the people of our city." It was merely a rich man's club. But the United States, in order to avoid publicity when the war was at its height, built, by using the Seabees, a highway over the mountain to a small beach on the west side of Trinidad, at a cost of more than \$500,000.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. How far is Trinidad from Nicaragua?

Mr. FERGUSON. I could not tell the Senator.

Mr. KERR. The Senator does not know.

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. KERR. Are they in the same hemisphere?

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. KERR. Are they on the same continent?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. KERR. How far is it from Bermuda to Nicaragua?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma knows. I am

merely trying to point out what is being done.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at the present time.

Mr. KERR. I do not blame the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I bring these matters to the attention of the Senate, because, after all, the Senator from Oklahoma and all the other Members of Congress are, as I have said, merely trustees for the taxpayers' money. Even though the people of Nicaragua might use oil and gas from the great State of Oklahoma, and even though they might use automobiles from the great State of Michigan, we have no right as trustees to take the taxpayers' money for the benefit of another nation, unless it is done as a part of the common defense. And, Mr. President, it is not certified here that it is part of our common defense. I am merely asking the Senate to consider this matter very carefully. I hope Senators will vote "no" and that the House will understand that we in the Senate are really trying to cut the nonessential expenditures of the Government of the United States, and that we are doing our very best to balance the budget.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, we are trustees for the taxpayers of the United States. If it were not for the fact that I thought we were, I would never have signed this conference report embracing the Rama Road project. We had no part in making the promise. It was made by the late President Roosevelt to the President of Nicaragua during the war. Whether the same consideration which led General Eisenhower to write the letter which has been cited by the Senator from Michigan, also led President Roosevelt to make the promise, I do not know. We have been told that it goes back to an implied promise that we were going to build the Nicaraguan Canal. Be that as it may, the road project has been started. Be that as it may, General Eisenhower did say that it had some military significance, at the time he wrote the letter.

Mr. FERGUSON. He said it could have.

Mr. CASE. That it could have some military significance, he said, at the time he wrote the letter. I recall that some years ago, just prior to the time we got into World War II, we were asked to appropriate funds for the building of a third set of locks in order to have an alternate route across the Isthmus of Panama. I opposed that at the time. I was one of those who fought the appropriation of that money, because I said there would not be time to build the alternate canal, if it were to do us any good in World War II. When we got into World War II, we suspended the work, proving that those of us who opposed it at the time were right from the standpoint of spending money.

During World War II we built the Alcan Highway, because we wanted an alternate route to Alaska in the case

the water route should be made unusable, that is, in case the submarines made it impossible to use the water route. So we built the Alcan Highway, and did it with the war dollar.

It is true, as the Senator from Michigan says, that perhaps a potential enemy now is located in this hemisphere. He may not be in the Isthmus of Panama; but if war comes, the Panama Canal would be probably one of his most vital targets. Some sort of alternate route to get transports from the Atlantic to the Pacific without going around the Horn is important and essential.

This item is purely an authorization; it is not an appropriation. It is not like the other parts of the highway bill, in which authorizations are made. The Appropriations Committee still retains control, and the distinguished Senator from Michigan, as one of the hardest working members of that committee, will have another bite at the cherry, so to speak, because he can oppose the appropriation.

But it seems to me we would be derelict in our trusteeship for the American taxpayer if, having started this road and having the assurance of the required treaty agreement that the road would be open to our commerce on the same terms that it would be open to the commerce of Nicaragua, we failed to take advantage of the opportunity to complete an alternate route across from the Atlantic to the Pacific. It is not a canal, to be sure, but at least it is a medium by which we could transport material from one ocean to the other without having to go around the Horn. So it seems to me that we would be derelict in our duty if we did not approve the authorization.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is familiar with the fact that highways cross Panama, is he not?

Mr. CASE. Yes. I have ridden on them.

Mr. FERGUSON. They are much narrower, are they not?

Mr. CASE. Yes. I repeat, I have ridden on them.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator does not anticipate now that Russia is capable of destroying the Panama Canal, does he?

Mr. CASE. I certainly do.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator does?

Mr. CASE. I certainly do.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan does not share that belief.

Mr. CASE. The Senator from Michigan must know that if the central lake, which is the key to the Panama Canal, were destroyed, it could not be replaced within a year and a half, and upon it depends the collection of water for the floating of ships through the Canal.

Mr. FERGUSON. We have the highway there. The Rama Road does not go clear across Nicaragua. It goes only to Managua.

Mr. CASE. It goes to a point, I understand, where lighters could come up to the water from the bay. It does provide

transportation; at least testimony was given to that effect.

Mr. FERGUSON. I find nothing in the testimony on that point.

Mr. CASE. That was the testimony given by our Ambassador to Nicaragua, the Honorable Tom Whalen, who came here at the time we were having hearings on it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Ambassador Waynick and Mr. Miller so testified.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Miller, of the State Department.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And Mr. James, of the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. CASE. In fact, this particular point was one I raised when I looked at the map. I said, "Why build the road here, when it does not go clear out to the water?" The answer was, "Because of the deep river which makes it possible by lighter to move commerce up to this city." So the road actually does provide an alternate transportation route across Nicaragua.

Mr. FERGUSON. In case of war, how much freight does the Senator think would be transported across a road such as this to lighters on this river? To what extent does he believe that munitions could be transported on that route?

Mr. CASE. In point of tonnage, I do not know; but it might be that some very essential materials could be transported over it—probably as much as we could have sent to Alaska over the Alcan Highway which we built during the war. If the Senate thinks there is any military value in this road, if General Eisenhower thought it could have strategic value, and if we want it, we should build it before the next war is on us.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator refers to a time when we were building air fields in Central and South America. But this is an entirely new project. We face a new world. We face a new condition.

Mr. CASE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are trying to raise enough money to prepare ourselves throughout the world.

Mr. CASE. Yes. We face an enemy that could send 70 percent of her planes over continental United States, as the Chief of our Air Force has said. If that be true, then certainly we face an enemy that could drop a bomb that could destroy Central Lake in the Panama Canal.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it estimated that Russia could send 70 percent of her planes to America?

Mr. CASE. It has been stated that she could.

Mr. FERGUSON. May I ask, 70 percent of what planes? How many planes does Russia have that she could send?

Mr. CASE. I do not know.

Mr. FERGUSON. They could send them to the Panama Canal, too, I assume.

Mr. CASE. I certainly know that it would be possible for the Panama Canal to be knocked out without very much trouble, in spite of all the defensive works we have there. We have put in extra equipment, but anyone who has listened to the semiclassified testimony regarding the Panama Canal must recognize

that the Panama Canal is not necessarily defensible.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I have listened to debate with respect to the freight that could be carried by lighter on the waterway to this road. Am I correct in that? Did not the Senator from South Dakota make that statement?

Mr. CASE. That was the testimony before the committee.

Mr. WELKER. I am wondering if we cannot do more with airplanes than with lighters.

Mr. CASE. That may be; but if there are ships expecting to go through the canal, and the canal is knocked out, we might need an alternate route.

The Appropriations Committee will pass upon the authorization, but it seems to me, as a member of the conference committee on this bill, and in the face of the testimony we had, we should make it possible for this road to be completed. We started it. We can quit if we want to and I am not stressing anything at all about the moral argument involved. I am only saying that we have enough invested in it to justify us in going along with the position of the House.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I rise to support strongly the position taken by the Senator from South Dakota. In asking for the approval of the conference report, I want the RECORD clearly to show that the report was not a one-way document and the result of the conference was not a one-way settlement. For instance, the House had declined to do anything in support of the speeding of construction of the interstate highway system which at least some Members of the Senate committee thought constituted the greatest bottleneck in our whole security system, so far as highway facilities were concerned.

The Senate put in an additional item of \$50,000,000 for each year to be used solely on interstate highway construction, on a fifty-fifty matching basis with the States.

The House was reluctant to give in at all on that point, because the conferees claimed, and properly so, that in a sense this would be a disturbance of the time-honored basis of allocation between the primary aid, secondary aid, and urban aid systems which are the normal portions of the Federal aid set-up. But the House yielded on that point by agreeing that \$25,000,000 per year or half of the sum that was voted by the Senate, in its discretion, should remain in the conference report.

The House had not put into the bill anything affecting defense access highways. The Senate committee, in the beginning, at the time of the hearings, had felt that was the proper course, but because of the long delay which intervened before we could finally get the bill reported by the full committee, and because of the very great need for defense access highways, we felt we should have an item for access highways, and we placed in the bill an item of \$50,-

000,000 for that purpose, which the Senate approved. The House was still of the feeling that separate legislation should be required. There is good ground for that feeling, but, finally, after long discussion back and forth, it was agreed that because of the time situation the House would yield to the Senate upon that particular item.

I could mention other items in which the House yielded to the Senate and to the positions taken by action of the Senate. This happens to be one of the items, Mr. President, in which the House would not yield to the Senate position, but, instead, took the position that the House had determined that there was a moral obligation upon our Government, and that aside from that the method which they had laid down in their particular bill for handling this matter was a good approach and was an approach which the Congress should recognize.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate at this time to the fact that not only is the amount different and the time factor different in the House bill from that which the Senate passed upon and disapproved, but, also, there are five safeguards written into the formula of the House bill, some of which were not written into the Senate bill, and upon which the House was relying. In order that the Senate may have information as to those safeguards, I want to read the part of the conference report which provides that these five things must take place before any expenditure can be made, even if appropriations are made. Before expenditures can be made under this authorization these five particular safeguards have to be provided.

The first safeguard is that there must be a request received from the Republic of Nicaragua and an agreement entered into based upon that request, which shall provide that the Republic of Nicaragua—

(1) will provide, without participation of funds herein authorized, all necessary right-of-way for the construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall be of a minimum width where practicable of 100 meters in rural areas and 50 meters in municipalities and shall forever be held inviolate as a part of the highway for public use;

(2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit any such toll to be charged for the use of said highway by vehicles or persons;

(3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly, any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of said road by vehicles or persons from the United States that does not apply equally to vehicles or persons of such Republic;

(4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance with the provisions of the Convention for the Regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington on December 15, 1943, and to which such Republic and the United States are parties; or any other treaty or international convention establishing similar reciprocal recognition; and

(5) will maintain said road after its completion in proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.

A portion, but a small portion, of these five requirements was embraced in the text of the Senate bill upon which the Senate passed.

The conference report does not endeavor to envision the complete authori-

zation of the highway, but it does follow the terms of the House bill in authorizing an appropriation of \$2,000,000 a year, or \$4,000,000 in all, for the two fiscal years 1953-54, and 1954-55.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. The point has been made by those who are supporting the report, that there is really a moral obligation involved. Does the Senator so hold?

Mr. HOLLAND. I not only hold that point, but there is specific testimony in the RECORD with reference to it. I should now like to quote from the testimony of the Assistant Secretary of State. I shall not read the matters of inducement having to do with the old treaty and the negotiations, but simply that part which bears on the commitment made:

Accordingly, on April 8, 1942, this Government—

That means our Government—

in an official note stated that it would be willing to construct a highway between San Benito and Rama and to survey and recommend a route from Rama to El Bluff.

In order to make the RECORD perfectly clear, San Benito, one terminus of the road, connects with the Inter-American Highway, and in effect connects with the west coast, or the Pacific coast side of the Republic of Nicaragua. The Rama end of the road is at the head of navigation on a river on the Atlantic, or Caribbean, side of Nicaragua. So this road, when completed, will be the first vehicular road across Nicaragua, and will enable transportation by motor vehicle from one ocean to the other.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield again to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Was this obligation entered into by treaty, or by executive action?

Mr. HOLLAND. It was entered into by Executive action. I may say to the Senator that it was entered into during the progress of the Second World War, at a time when the President of the United States had authority to spend large emergency funds in this and other fields.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Was it not the result of a treaty?

Mr. HOLLAND. It flowed out of an earlier treaty. But let me continue my statement.

We were in the midst of the war, and this negotiation took place in the spring of 1942. I do not have to remind Senators that that was a time when submarines were sinking ships off the Atlantic coast and in the Gulf and Caribbean, as well. I am certain I do not have to remind Senators that those were tense days.

The President of the United States, in pursuance of emergency powers granted him for the expenditure of emergency

funds, obligated the United States to build the Rama road, so far as transportation was concerned for the time being as a substitute for the Canal.

If I may go back, the obligation under the treaty of many years before was a disputed one. The treaty called for the giving of a right to the United States to build a second canal across the Isthmus through Nicaragua. The United States held that under the treaty it had simply an option to build a second canal. The Republic of Nicaragua held that the United States was obligated to build the canal. The point at issue between the two Presidents was whether or not the United States would then build the canal.

The President of the United States having in mind the fact that the Republic of Nicaragua was contending for the other position, and having in mind also the fact, as is shown by the record, that the Republic of Nicaragua had declared war the day after the United States had declared war, and had made available to us very valuable port rights on the Pacific, which we were then using, committed the United States to build the road.

Not only that, but actual construction of the road was begun, and the road was almost half completed during the progress of the war, at an expenditure of some \$4,000,000 taken from the President's emergency fund.

The matter before Congress is simply whether we are going to carry through and complete an obligation entered into at a time of great tension, at a time of great danger to our country and to all our allies. The question is whether we should see this project through. It was the unanimous verdict of the Senate Committee on Public Works that we should. It was the verdict of the House, in the words prescribed in the House bill, that it should be done. After the conference committee had concluded its work, it was the verdict—and I believe the unanimous verdict—of the conference committee that this was something we should do.

I may say that the two conferees from the other side of the aisle were the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is present, and the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who I understand is perhaps in a hospital today, and I regret to hear that he is. However, the report of the conference was unanimous.

We believe the House made very material concessions to the Senate in the course of the conference. We feel that this item is in effect a minor provision of the bill. We believe this item is a commitment that we should carry out and see through to completion.

I should say to the Senate that it is not intended that this money should be turned over to someone else. The road construction is to be done by our own Bureau of Public Roads, by our own engineers. The road will fulfill an important objective.

Mr. FLANDERS and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield further to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. So far as I can see, from what the Senator has said about the testimony, there is a real commitment.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. FLANDERS. If there is no commitment that is binding upon us, I for one would want to repudiate commitments of this sort which are not covered by treaty or other agreements which must be passed upon by the Senate. If there was a commitment made in wartime, under authority given by the Senate, that is another proposition. If that is the situation, I feel that I must support the conference report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have heard no one question the fact that the commitment was made by the President in time of war pursuant to emergency powers, and at a time when he thought that the entire work would be completed out of emergency funds then entrusted to him. It proved to be the case, at that remote distance, that the difficulties involved in completion of construction were not realized during wartime.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator advise the Senate of the words of the commitment? Is it not true that only a certain amount of money was given, which was \$4,000,000? It was anticipated that the road could be built for a little more than \$2,000,000. I do not believe the office of the Secretary of State contends that there was an Executive agreement made in wartime to build the highway.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall quote the direct words again.

Mr. FERGUSON. But what was the instrument? Did he produce the instrument or the Executive agreement?

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not recall that he did.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; and when the War Investigating Committee tried to get the documents, we could never get them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Senator questioning the agreement? If he is, he is the first one who has questioned, throughout all the discussion, the veracity of the Assistant Secretary of State, who meticulously covered the whole subject and specifically said that we were committed. I read his words:

Accordingly, on April 8, 1942, this Government in an official note stated that it would be willing—

Not to make \$4,000,000 available, but—to construct a highway between San Bernito and Rama and to survey and recommend a route from Rama to El Bluff.

I think I should place in the RECORD the fact that while Rama is at the head of navigation on the river, El Bluff is at the mouth of the river, and it is the expressed desire of the Republic of Nicaragua eventually to build, at its own ex-

pense, an extension of the road to go all the way to the Caribbean. But that is not necessary for the purpose or objective, which was that we have a highway across the Isthmus from one sea to the other.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. During an investigation by the War Investigating Committee, I attempted to get documents which were supposed to incorporate this commitment, but I was never able to get such documents. That is the reason, and the only reason, why I am raising the question of our actual commitment under an executive agreement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I may say that in the argument in the Senate on this same point but a few days ago, according to my recollection the Senator from Michigan made no such point and no such claim, and the Senate stood upon the official ground that we were informed officially that an official note had been exchanged in connection with this matter. We were informed officially that \$4,000,000 had already been spent in the construction of the project and that it was practically half completed.

We were informed officially by the Assistant Secretary of State—and I now quote from him:

I might point out in that connection that during World War II we received very valuable cooperation from Nicaragua, which was agreed upon just about that time, in connection with the use of certain ports on the Pacific Coast, in which we, in effect, got base rights.

I asked the question:

And did the granting of those base rights and the cooperation by Nicaragua, falling at that same time, constitute a part of the over-all objective which the President and the United States Government had in view?

The answer from the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Miller, was:

Yes, sir; very much so.

If that does not constitute an obligation of the type which this great Nation would want to recognize, as obligating itself to one of its smaller neighbors, who, nevertheless, acted as a sister republic in helping us as it could in that time of great danger, the Senator from Florida does not know how to interpret the words.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator realize that Nicaragua had declared war, and was a part of the war machine, with some obligation to America to furnish ports? Would it not have been well, if we have these so-called executive agreements, if somehow or other we could obtain them, to ascertain really what they call for, and whether part of the consideration was as indicated? I do not understand that Mr. Miller was with the Government at that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems to the Senator from Florida that the Senator from Michigan is practicing some real hair splitting.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not trying to split hairs.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Michigan is not questioning at all the specific statement made by the Assistant Secretary of State, to the effect that there was an official note on this subject, by which we obligated ourselves. The only question which could possibly be raised is whether or not this is the time to recognize our obligations. The Department of State, the Department of Defense, and other agencies, including the Bureau of Public Roads, from which we heard, are strongly of the view that this half-built road should be continued and completed, and that it is ridiculous to leave it in the half-built condition in which it now exists, when it serves no one, and particularly when it operates as a constant thorn in the flesh, to prevent the truly friendly relations and the real good will which we would like to see exist in that particular quarter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator no doubt is familiar with the statement to be found on page 368 of the RECORD, wherein Mr. Miller said:

The Department realizes fully that such an agreement cannot bind the Congress later to appropriate funds for its fulfillment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I recall that well; and I am glad now to call the Senator's attention to page 371 of the printed record, showing the exact text of the communication from the President of the United States to the Republic of Nicaragua, under date of April 8, 1942, and the answer of the Republic of Nicaragua. I do not think it is necessary to read the entire text into the RECORD at this time, although I shall be very happy to do so if any Senator wishes to hear it. I believe that the printed record is available to all Senators. Suffice it to say that I had forgotten the fact that the Assistant Secretary of State did produce, and there was exhibited to the committee, and there is copied into the record of the hearings, a complete recital of the contents of the note addressed by President Roosevelt on April 8, 1942, to the Nicaraguan Minister for Foreign Affairs, which constitutes the obligation under which we now proceed.

Mr. President, perhaps this is a small matter in terms of dollars and cents, but I think it is a very large matter from the standpoint of our demonstrating whether or not we propose meticulously to observe our commitments, even to those who are weaker than we, even to those who cannot in any way enforce their will against us, but who can point to this particular textual commitment made by the President of the United States on behalf of our Nation, in time of mortal combat, and which we recognized to the extent of having proceeded, so that the road is substantially half completed.

The Senator from Florida does not believe that there will be found in this body Members who will quibble over the question of the existence of an obligation in such a situation. It makes no difference to what party a President of

the United States may belong. It makes no difference what philosophy the President of the United States may espouse. He may not be of our particular philosophy. But if he speaks for our Nation during such a time and under such conditions of stress, and then proceeds to act upon that statement, as he did, by making available \$4,000,000, which was actually used on this program at that time, I do not believe that any Senator can successfully question the fact that that course of dealing meant something, and that we were obligating ourselves to go through with the task which we undertook jointly with the Republic of Nicaragua.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. When was the \$4,000,000 expended on construction? When was the construction work actually stopped? How many years ago was it stopped?

Mr. HOLLAND. As the Senator from Florida recalls, there has been no construction work since World War II.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Can the Senator explain why there has been a delay of several years, and why the project was not completed as originally committed, according to the statement of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. HOLLAND. The statement by the Assistant Secretary of State was to the effect that the \$4,000,000 allocated did not prove sufficient, and when we asked him why it did not prove sufficient he stated that the cost of materials and labor went up tremendously during the war, which would be no news to any Member of the Senate. It was found that the amount allocated did not nearly suffice to complete the job. By the time the war was over and the first part of the job was completed, no further funds were available to which to turn; and the Senator from Idaho knows, as well as do all other Senators, that we have been proceeding from day to day in an effort to catch up with the business of the Nation, which had fallen behind during World War II. I do not believe it is difficult to understand why this particular item should not have been given immediate or first attention.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I cannot understand why, in the face of that commitment, this particular project was not completed several years ago. If the United States was obligated to complete it, why has there been an interim of 6, 7, or 8 years, during which no effort was made by the Public Works Committee or the executive department of this Government to complete the project in compliance with the commitment? Can the Senator explain that?

Mr. HOLLAND. I will say to the Senator from Idaho—

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield, and then I shall reply to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the majority leader a question. Many

Senators are asking me how late the Senate is to remain in session this evening in connection with the Defense Production Act. When I talked with the majority leader earlier in the day I understood that we were to have a night session. I understand that it is possible that the Senate may be in session as late as 8 or 9 o'clock. As I understand the situation, several amendments remain to be disposed of. There is an amendment by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPLE], an amendment by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], There is also another seizure amendment of some kind. I intend to offer an amendment. What shall I tell Members on this side of the aisle? If we are to have a night session, how late will it be?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there is no use in having a night session unless we are to complete consideration of the bill, or come somewhere near completion. If we continue to postpone action on the bill from day to day, Senators will manufacture a few more amendments and we shall be here indefinitely. I regret very much that the conference report was brought up this afternoon. I wanted to complete consideration of the pending bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think there is more of a chance of getting rid of the conference report, one way or the other, than there is disposing of the war production bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. That may be true. If it is not true, the chances of disposing of the conference report are pretty slim.

I should like to know how much longer the debate on the conference report is to continue. Then perhaps I could answer the question of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is my purpose to continue with the conference report until the Senate votes upon it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I simply wish to know how late we should expect to remain here. I do not wish to shut off any Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There may be one or two other Senators who wish to speak on the conference report.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from New Mexico knows that I would never suggest that he or any other Senator be denied an opportunity to speak. What I wish to know is, Will we be here until 9 o'clock, 10 o'clock, or later?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I cannot tell the Senator when we shall conclude consideration of the conference report, any more than he can tell me when the Senate will complete consideration of the bill in which he is interested.

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not suggest that the Senator answer that question.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall proceed to answer the question very courteously asked me by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK]. If there are other questions, I shall answer them, but so far as I know I shall then be through.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I was glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wanted to know how late we would sit after we conclude action on the conference report.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in reply to the question asked of me by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], I would say that the Senator from Florida was not on the road subcommittee of the Public Works Committee 2 years ago when the last omnibus road bill was reported, but he does remember that this item was contained in the bill as reported by the Senate. He is not able to state anything about the testimony before the subcommittee. Whether the item was voted out by the Senate or went out in conference, the Senator from Florida does not recall. But the Senator from Florida knows that the item was in the bill 2 years ago, as reported by the Senate committee, and he knows also that we have been proceeding with the actual construction from year to year on the Inter-American Highway, which is more important than this highway, and which has had the continuing attention of Congress during the time that the Senator from Florida has been in the Senate.

Mr. President, the item is in the conference report. It is a very small item. It represents one of the several concessions which the Senate is making, whereas the House is making many more concessions, amounting to larger amounts of money. In view of the nature of the item and the relatively unimportant substance of it, as compared with the large items that are agreed to in the bill, the Senator from Florida hopes that we will not much longer hold up the adoption of the conference report.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a few facts. First, the conference report before the Senate was signed by every member of the conference committee. The differences in the bill as passed by the two Houses were discussed for many hours by the conferees. One of the items agreed to early in the conference was the one objected to by the Senator from Michigan. There was not the slightest opposition to the item from any member of the conference committee, nor was there any lack of complete support of the item from any member of the conference committee.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan made a statement a while ago to the effect that he thought the State of Oklahoma was shipping oil and gasoline to Nicaragua, or wondered if that was the fact. Perhaps the question, or the inference is typical of the lack of information of the Senator with reference to the background and content and purpose of the items in the bill.

I must say, Mr. President, that if I represented a State which manufactures as many automobiles as are manufactured in the State represented by the Senator from Michigan, which use oil and its products to the extent they are being used in this country, I believe I would know that the United States imports in excess of a million barrels of crude oil a day to be refined in the United States;

that the products of such oil go into our wartime effort and our peacetime economy, and that our country exports but little oil and no gasoline.

I am happy to inform the Senator from Michigan of that fact, because, as a representative of a great State, whose economy is so closely geared to the manufacture of vehicles using oil and gasoline, and whose economy is tied into it in so many ways, I am sure that the information will be welcome to him.

I am astounded that he did not have the information, because it would occur to the Senator from Oklahoma that he could not have avoided collision with that information many, many times in the weeks, days, months, and years past during which those facts have been available.

Another statement which the Senator from Michigan made in opposition was in connection with money which had been spent in Bermuda and Trinidad. I was astounded at that statement, because I did not think that either of those places was on this continent, let alone tied to, affected by, or affecting Nicaragua. Upon my asking the distinguished Senator from Michigan, he reaffirmed my belief that one of them was not on this continent. When I asked him about the other one he declined to yield further. I must say that I have since attempted to get confirmation of my impression, and in order that he may be informed, if he has any doubt about it, I will say that neither Bermuda nor Trinidad is on this continent.

In my opinion, the Rama Road item is justified by good faith. As has been so ably and clearly stated by the distinguished Senator from Florida, and as was presented to and accepted by the conference committee, it is the result of a commitment by the President of the United States. It is a wise commitment, because it is good business for this country. It is good business because, as the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] so ably reminded us it is a part of a series of transactions out of which grew a perpetual grant to this Government to build a second canal from the Atlantic to the Pacific across Nicaragua, if we so desired to do.

Standing out in the picture of our national defense are two facts clear and apparent to anyone who wants to see or be impressed by them, one of which is the vulnerability of the Panama Canal, the other of which is the necessity for this country to have available other means of communication and transportation between the Atlantic and the Pacific, which other means were in the minds of those representing this Government when the grant was obtained for permission to build a second canal across Nicaragua.

Mr. President, the whole principle of the good neighbor policy is involved in this item of the bill. We are the biggest, richest, and most powerful Nation on earth. Our relationships with the small country of Nicaragua have not always been those of a good neighbor or those of nations which wanted to develop the relationships of good neighbors. I do not need to remind the Members of the Sen-

ate of the black marks against the record of this country in connection with its relations with Nicaragua.

If we now took action resulting in a refusal to build this road, we would be saying that because we are big enough and because we are strong enough to do it, we would repudiate an agreement made with our good neighbor and our little neighbor, on which agreement our neighbor not only had a right to depend, but with reference to which our neighbor took action which actually went beyond anything our Nation ever did, so far as I know, for a foreign power—for at that time Nicaragua impaired her sovereignty to the extent that she granted to the United States a perpetual easement to build a canal across Nicaragua. I must say that was a very far-reaching grant, made at that time to the United States by Nicaragua.

As a result of our failure to build the canal in accordance with the indications given when that permission was granted, a commitment was made by the President of the United States that a highway would be built to provide for Nicaragua a part of the transportation facilities which would have been available had the canal been built, and to provide for us a part of the transportation facilities between the two oceans which we would need in the event of necessity, if we either lost the use of or lost control of the Panama Canal.

I am astounded that the Senator from Michigan would take the position either that we should repudiate our commitment to our little neighbor or that we should be so indifferent to the elements of our own national defense that we would not take advantage of this opportunity to provide alternate means of transportation between the two oceans, if it is available to us to such an extent and for such a reasonable cost.

Mr. President, the report of the committee of conference has been worked on for hours, and it has been unanimously agreed to by the conferees. The report is now before the Senate, approval; and I believe it should be approved.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GEORGE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings in connection with the call of the roll be suspended, and that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded; and at this time I ask for a division on the question of agreeing to the conference report.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none.

The question is on agreeing to the report, and the Senate will now proceed to divide.

On a division the report was agreed to.

REENROLLMENT AND CORRECTION OF BILL

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 221, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 7340) to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following corrections:

In the first sentence of section 5 of the bill strike out "4,000,000," and insert in lieu thereof "2,000,000," and strike out the word "completing."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2594) to extend the provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment identified as "6-2-52-C," and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, after line 6, it is proposed to insert the following new sections:

SEC. . Section 402 (c) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Each regulation, order, or amendment of or supplement to a regulation issued under this title shall be such as will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of this title, and shall include a statement of the considerations involved in the issuance of such regulation, order, amendment, or supplement. Such statement of considerations shall set forth the objectives to be achieved by the regulation, the reasons why the attainment of such objectives will further the purposes of the act, the means by which such objectives are to be achieved, and a finding of the facts upon which the President bases and justifies the provisions of such regulation, order, amendment, or supplement, and shall be regarded as a part of such regulation, order, amendment, or supplement. The President, in establishing and adjusting ceilings with respect to materials and services, and in stabilizing and adjusting wages, salaries, and other compensation, shall make provisions in all regulations or orders for individual applications for adjustments to prevent or correct hardships or inequities."

SEC. . Section 402 (d) (3) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Any person who is subject to a ceiling price on an agricultural commodity or any material processed therefrom and who is aggrieved by any action taken or not taken by the President pursuant to this paragraph may protest such action or failure to act pursuant to section 407 of this act."

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, the proposed amendment to section 402 (c) of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is designed to provide that at the time of the issuance of a regulation the President must make findings of fact and include them in his statement of considerations. That, of course, means those who are administering the act.

It is a fundamental principle of administrative law that no regulatory agency should be permitted to issue orders in the absence of basic or essential findings of fact supporting such orders. The absence of such basic or essential findings required to support an administrative agency's order should render it void, in my judgment.

Yet in the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, the Congress failed to lay down the same rule for the Office of Price Stabilization that it has laid down for the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission and all the rest.

At the time of the passage of the statute under which the Office of Price Administration operated during and after World War II, the general counsel of OPA, as I recall, told the Senate Banking and Currency Committee said in substance that findings of fact were to accompany price regulations.

OPA did follow this practice until in *Allied Foods v. Bowles* (151 F. 2d 449) a regulation of OPA was set aside because it conflicted with the facts found by the Administrator.

Subsequently, the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration abandoned the practice of making specific findings of fact to support regulatory orders.

There have been no findings of fact to accompany OPS regulations and in the case of retail food price regulations and other regulations, serious injury to the industries affected has resulted.

For example, the regulation fixing new ceiling prices on dry groceries and some other products, CPR 15, was issued on March 28, 1951. The Defense Production Act required the Director of OPS, insofar as was practicable, to ascertain and give due consideration to comparable prices, margins, and so forth, in effect during the pre-Korean period.

But the Director made no study of pre-Korean prices and margins in the retail food industry before issuing CPR 15. After rejecting evidence offered by the industry, he made a guess with regard to margins. He made a promise, at the time the regulation was issued, to make a survey of margin and earning figures and said that mark-ups in CPR 15 would be promptly revised if they proved either too high or too low.

The promise was made in March 1951. I am sorry to say it has not been kept. As a matter of fact, the survey referred to did not actually get under way until March 1952. It will not be completed in time for analysis and action before the present act is renewed or allowed to expire.

In the case of other food regulations, CPR 25, Supplemental Regulation 47,

Supplemental Regulation 65, and Supplemental Regulation 69, OPS action was taken, as it was in the case of CPR 15, in the absence of any findings of fact whatsoever.

The Office of Price Stabilization attempts to make it appear that only Safeway Stores seek amendments to the Defense Production Act which will force OPS to issue findings of fact with its price regulations.

This is not the case. Four retail food groups, the National Association of Independent Retail Grocers, the Cooperative Food Distributors of America, the Super Market Institute, and the National Association of Food Chains have gone formally on record as favoring the changes in court procedure.

We submit that the OPS objection to the proposed amendment, as expressed in a letter by Ellis Arnall, Director of OPS, dated May 20, 1952, is not a valid argument.

A portion of the letter states:

The enactment of the proposed amendment would tend to transform the statement of considerations into a rather legalistic document of no use to businessmen, since it would then be necessary to couch much of it in conclusory language typical of the Federal Trade Commission.

With respect to these regulations, I feel that if we are to have price controls—and I am hoping that we shall not have to look forward to them always—the rules and regulations established should be promulgated in such a way as to enable persons operating businesses to know under what rules they were expected to operate and to what rules they must conform. I feel, personally, that it is not asking too much to expect the OPS regulatory authorities to make findings.

I may say that I have done some checking into this situation. I have checked the records of the proceedings of our hearings, and I feel that here is a practical step with which the OPS authorities should comply. Other people are required to meet rules and regulations; but they are not asked to operate in the dark, as is the case in many instances when it comes to food processors and distributors.

My amendment is intended to correct the situation which resulted when the Director of the Office of Price Stabilization fixed ceilings on pork products at a time when hogs were selling below parity.

Apparently this action violated section 402 (d) (3) of the act.

It was protested by processors of hogs and by a grocery chain.

The OPS denied the protest. The grocery chain took the matter to the Emergency Court of Appeals.

The court held that only the producers of hogs could protest the ceiling.

It is a grave question what their legal status would be if they protested the ceiling.

Ceiling prices on pork have been in effect since January 26, 1951, and supplemental regulations have been issued on pork. But pork still is selling below ceilings which still are, in the judgment of many, violating the act.

This amendment would provide legal recourse to test such actions by OPS.

I feel very definitely and strongly about it. When violations of orders and rules which have not been clearly established and set forth occur, the persons who are called upon to answer should have their day in court.

I want to say one other thing before I conclude, Mr. President. The National Grange, which has looked into many of these questions involving controls and how controls have operated, sent me a communication, dated June 9, 1952, signed by the legislative counsel of the Grange, in which it is stated:

We are in favor of proposed amendments to the Defense Production Act, which we understand have been introduced by Senator SCHOEPEL, which would require that:

1. Each order or regulation be accompanied by a statement explaining in detail why the order or regulation is needed, i. e., what the economic situation is that justifies the order or regulation.

2. What the order or regulation will achieve.

3. A detailed justification otherwise for the issuance and enforcement of the order or regulation.

4. That any individual that suffers unusual hardships as a result of an order or regulation has the right to apply for special adjustments, to be heard in connection therewith, and to special relief if unusual hardship is established at such hearings.

5. That any citizen that is unduly handicapped or placed in a position of hardship because of ceilings on an agricultural product or a product manufactured therefrom, shall have the right to apply for adjustment whether he or she be a farmer or in a non-agriculture occupation, and shall be granted a hearing and such adjustment as will bring relief from the unusual hardship imposed by an order or regulation.

I am hopeful that the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee will see fit to take the amendment to the conference. I think that is only fair if we are going to have controls in operation. I do not know how long they are going to be in operation, but certainly as I view the situation, we should have the benefit of a clarification of many of the issues.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has told me that he intends to offer a seizure amendment—and if I am incorrect, I hope the Senator will correct me—

Mr. CASE. It will be an amendment with reference to a limited form of compulsory arbitration.

Mr. MAYBANK. But I understand the Senator has an amendment which he will offer?

Mr. CASE. It will be offered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I do not want to do anything hastily. If the Senator offers his amendment, I shall offer mine tomorrow. I told the Senator from Illinois that I intended to do that, and I told him that if he did not offer his amendment I would not offer mine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from South Carolina speaking on his own time?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. I want no borrowed time.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I do not want to get caught in a cross-fire here.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am afraid the Senator is already caught in one. If we are going to have seizure amendments offered at the hour of 6 o'clock, we should not do anything more this afternoon. I was perfectly willing to go along, but I do not want to be put "behind the 8 ball" as I was yesterday.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, could we not have a unanimous-consent agreement limiting the number of amendments to 3 more?

Mr. MAYBANK. No, Mr. President. With my deep interest in the national welfare, after listening to Mr. McCloy this morning, and knowing what goes on in Korea, I certainly intend to do everything I can to have steel produced within 24 hours, if possible, and I intend also, Mr. President, to be fair to those who work in the steel mills and to the management.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may make an inquiry, without either side yielding time?

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent to be allowed a few minutes to try to find out what we are going to do and what we are not going to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to determine whether we are going to continue, one day after another, taking up new amendments. More amendments are prepared each night, and if that is to continue indefinitely, the consideration of the bill could be prolonged for 2 weeks, because there is a good manufacturing machine somewhere around the Senate that can produce amendments faster than we can vote on them.

Unless we can get some kind of agreement in line with the one which the Senator from Indiana has just suggested, we had better stay here all night, because perhaps that manufacturing machine does not work at night. Perhaps it closes down, or operates under union shop rules, or some other kind of rules.

Mr. President, may I now inquire how many Senators have amendments they desire to offer? I understand the Senator from South Dakota has one.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have two amendments that have been printed and have been before the Senate for a week.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from South Dakota has two amendments. The Senator from South Carolina has one amendment. Are there any other amendments besides those and the one now pending?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have an amendment, but I understand it is acceptable to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. McFARLAND. Then, that is another amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be limited to

the four which have just been mentioned.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I expect to offer the amendments in modified form, but the amendments I shall propose deal with the subject matter covered in the printed amendments.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, it seems to me that this is altogether too important a measure to foreclose action on amendments. If the bill is to go over until tomorrow, amendments might occur to Senators, and the amendments might be very useful, valuable, or essential. I object to any such limitation as is proposed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well. We will work a while.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Kansas will withdraw his amendment, because in all sincerity I said I did not approve the amendment, that I was opposed to it, but that I would take it to conference with that understanding, and that I would not be bound by action of the House, if it adopted a similar provision. My statement was on the assumption that we would get through with the bill tonight, but it must be apparent to the Senator from Kansas that we will not finish with the bill, and if the Senator insists upon having the amendment in the bill, the responsibility does not rest on this side of the aisle. Other members of the committee object to it.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Do I understand correctly that the distinguished chairman of the committee is agreeable to taking the amendment to conference? If so, I have no objection.

Mr. MAYBANK. I said if we finished consideration of the control bill tonight, and no other amendments would be offered except the amendment of the Senator from Kansas and the amendment of the Senator from Texas, which, in effect, in my judgment, is a statement of the law of Texas, I would be glad to agree to those two amendments, provided there were no others, but I would not be bound to support them in conference. I cannot say any more than that, because the Senator from South Dakota intends to call up his seizure amendment, and I understood the Senator from New York had an amendment, although perhaps he is not going to offer it. I am speaking very frankly, as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am not going to stay here until a late hour and have a control bill passed without bringing up the seizure amendments. I do not wish to bring them up. I do not mean they are mine, but they are amendments offered from this side of the aisle by Senators who think that some positive action must be taken by the time August arrives.

Everyone knows that. Some may not like the President, but, after all, he is the President of the United States. The President of the United States knows that the Taft-Hartley law is available, and everyone knows that the President may invoke that law. But, the 80 days provided for in that law as a breathing spell would expire in August, and the question is, What will happen then?

Public Law 413 - 82d Congress
Chapter 462 - 2d Session
H. R. 7340

AN ACT

To amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), and all Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$550,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

Federal-Aid
Highway Act
of 1952.
23 U.S.C.
§ 9a note.
Appropriation.

The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be available for expenditure as follows:

(a) \$247,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system.

(b) \$165,000,000 for projects on the Federal-aid secondary highway system.

(c) \$137,500,000 for projects on the Federal-aid primary highway system in urban areas.

The sums authorized by this section for each fiscal year, respectively, shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law and in accordance with the formulas set forth in section 4 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838).

Apportionment.

Any sums apportioned to any State under the provision of this section shall be available for expenditure in that State for two years after the close of the fiscal year for which such sums are authorized, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of such period shall lapse: *Provided*, That such funds for any fiscal year shall be deemed to have been expended if a sum equal to the total of the sums apportioned to the State for such fiscal year is covered by formal agreements with the Commissioner of Public Roads for the improvement of specific projects as provided by this Act.

66 Stat. 158.
66 Stat. 159.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of expediting the construction, reconstruction, and improvement, inclusive of necessary bridges and tunnels, of the national system of interstate highways, designated in accordance with the provisions of section 7 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 838), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like additional sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955. The sum herein authorized for each fiscal year shall be apportioned among the several States in the manner now provided by law for the apportionment of Federal-aid primary funds: *Provided*, That the Federal share payable on account of any project provided for by funds made available under the provisions of this section shall be determined in the same manner as now provided by law for projects on said Federal-aid primary system.

Additional
appropriation.

23 U.S.C.
§ 60.

Federal
share.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 23 of the Federal Highway Act (42 Stat. 218), as amended and supplemented, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated (1) for forest highways the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955; and (2) for forest development roads and trails the sum of \$22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That with respect to any proposed

Forest roads.
23 U.S.C.
§ 23.

construction or reconstruction of a timber access road, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction: *And be it further provided*, That the appropriation herein authorized for forest highways shall be apportioned by the Secretary of Commerce for expenditure in the several States, Alaska, and Puerto Rico in accordance with the provision of section 3 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950.

23 U.S.C.
§ 23 note.

National
parks, etc.

16 U.S.C.
§§ 8a-8c.

SEC. 4. (a) For the construction, reconstruction, and improvement of roads and trails, inclusive of necessary bridges, in national parks, monuments, and other areas administered by the National Park Service, including areas authorized to be established as national parks and monuments, and national park and monument approach roads authorized by the Act of January 31, 1931 (46 Stat. 1053), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

Baltimore-
Washington
Parkway.

(b) For the construction, reconstruction, improvement, and maintenance of parkways, authorized by Acts of Congress, on lands to which title is vested in the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the limitation of \$13,000,000 on the cost of construction of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway prescribed by the Act of August 3, 1950 (64 Stat. 400), is hereby increased to \$14,500,000 and the additional sum of \$1,500,000 hereby authorized shall be available for contract immediately upon the passage of this Act.

Indian
reservations.

25 U.S.C.
§ 318a.

66 Stat. 159.
66 Stat. 160.

(c) For the construction, improvement, and maintenance of Indian reservation roads and bridges and roads and bridges to provide access to Indian reservations and Indian lands under the provisions of the Act approved May 26, 1928 (45 Stat. 750), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955: *Provided*, That the location, type, and design of all roads and bridges constructed shall be approved by the Commissioner of Public Roads before any expenditures are made thereon, and all such construction shall be under the general supervision of the Commissioner of Public Roads.

Nicaragua.

SEC. 5. Recognizing the mutual benefits that will accrue to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States from the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in said Republic of Nicaragua, the construction of which road was begun and partially completed pursuant to an agreement between said Republic and the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$2,600,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, for the construction of such road, to be available until expended. No expenditure shall be made hereunder for the construction of said road until a request therefor shall have been received by the Secretary of State from the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua nor until an agreement shall have been entered into by said Republic with the Secretary of State which shall provide, in part, that said Republic—

Restrictions.

(1) will provide, without participation of funds herein authorized, all necessary right-of-way for the construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall be of a minimum width where

practicable of one hundred meters in rural areas and fifty meters in municipalities and shall forever be held inviolate as a part of the highway for public use;

(2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit any such toll to be charged for the use of said highway by vehicles or persons;

(3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly, any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of said road by vehicles or persons from the United States that does not apply equally to vehicles or persons of such Republic;

(4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance with the provisions of the Convention for the Regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington on December 15, 1943, and to which such Republic and the United States are parties; or any other treaty or international convention establishing similar reciprocal recognition; and

61 Stat., Pt. 2,
p. 1129.

(5) will maintain said road after its completion in proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.

(b) The funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the terms of this Act for the survey and construction of the said road from San Benito to Rama and for the survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff in the Republic of Nicaragua without being matched by said Republic, and all expenditures made under the provisions of this Act for materials, equipment, and supplies, shall, whenever practicable, be made for products of the United States or of the Republic of Nicaragua.

Survey and
construction.

SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 1 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway" approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the Government of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and construction of the Inter-American Highway within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear.

Inter-American
Highway.

66 Stat. 160.
66 Stat. 161.

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized an emergency fund in the amount of \$10,000,000 for expenditure by the Commissioner of Public Roads, in accordance with the provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act, as amended and supplemented, after receipt of an application therefor from the highway department of any State, in the repair or reconstruction of highways and bridges on the Federal-aid highway systems, which he shall find have suffered serious damage as the result of disaster over a wide area, such as by floods, hurricanes, tidal waves, earthquakes, severe storms, landslides, or other catastrophes in any part

Emergency
fund.
42 Stat. 212.
23 U.S.C.
§ 1.

of the United States. The appropriation of such moneys as may be necessary for the initial establishment of this fund and for its replenishment on an annual basis is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That, pending the appropriation of said sum, or its replenishment, the Commissioner of Public Roads may expend, from existing Federal-Aid highway appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That no expenditures shall be made hereunder with respect to any such catastrophe in any State unless an emergency has been declared by the Governor of such State and concurred in by the Secretary of Commerce: *And provided further*, That the Federal share payable on account of any repair or reconstruction project provided for by funds made available under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost thereof.

Restrictions.

Federal
reservations.

SEC. 8. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 10 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785) there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations the sum of \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, to remain available until expended.

President's
Highway
Safety Conference.

SEC. 9. The Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized and directed to assist in carrying out the action program of the President's Highway Safety Conference and to cooperate with the State highway departments and other agencies in this program to advance the cause of safety on the streets and highways: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$150,000 shall be expended annually for the purposes of this section.

Access roads.
23 U.S.C.
§ 106 and
note.

SEC. 10. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, and section 12 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950 (64 Stat. 785), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$50,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That whenever any project for the construction or improvement of a circumferential highway around a city or of a radial intracity route thereto submitted by any State, is certified by the Secretary of Defense, or such other official as the President may designate, as being important for civilian or military defense, such project may be constructed under the authorization in this section and in accordance with the conditions contained therein: *And be it further provided*, That with respect to any proposed construction or reconstruction of a timber access road under the authority contained in this section, advisory public hearings shall be held at a place convenient or adjacent to the area of construction or reconstruction with notice and reasonable opportunity for interested persons to present their views as to the practicability and feasibility of such construction or reconstruction.

66 Stat. 161.
66 Stat. 162.

23 U.S.C.
§§ 60-63, 21,
23c, 3a note;
16 U.S.C.
§ 8b.
Separability.

SEC. 11. All provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 838); the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948, approved June 29, 1948 (62 Stat. 1105); and the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950, not inconsistent with this Act, shall remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 12. If any section, subsection, or other provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of such section, subsection, or other provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 13. That all Acts or parts of Acts in any way inconsistent with the provisions of this Act are hereby repealed, and this Act shall take effect on its passage.

SEC. 14. This Act may be cited as the Federal-Aid Highway Act of Short title. 1952.

Approved June 25, 1952.

468-A
46
2

3540 E